BYZANTION

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE STUDIES

(*American Series, II*)

Edited by

Henri Grégoire

with the collaboration of

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK, GEORGINA BUCKLER, J. L. LAMONTE,
SIRARPIE DER NERSESSIAN, A. A. VASILIEV,
GEORGE VERNADSKY

S. H. CROSS
Managing Editor

Volume XVI

Fascicle 2

1942-1943

Published by the Byzantine Institute, Inc.

THOMAS WHITTEMORE, *Director*

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

1944

BYZANTION

The publication of this volume was made possible by the assistance of the American Council of Learned Societies.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRINTING OFFICE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

REVIEWS

ITALO-BYZANTINE ETYMOLOGIES II [1]

By HENRY R. KAHANE

MIDDLE GREEK *τρικάνθιν "WING TRANSOM"

The origin of Ital. *dragante* "forte pezzo di legno disposto orizzontalmente sulla testa del dritto di poppa, e congiunto coi suoi estremi all'ultimo quinto poppiero," [2] and of the corresponding nautical terms Fr. *dragan*, Span. *dragante* has been much discussed. The last scholar who applied himself to the study of the word was Vidos.[3] He rejects the rather dubious etymon Span. *dragante* "figura que representa una cabeza de dragón o de serpiente, con la boca apierta, como mordiendo o tragando alguna cosa," [4] and advocates a derivation from Middle Gr. *τρικάντουνον* n. "triangle." This *τρικάντουνον* is a Gr. compound, whose second element, *καντούνι* n. "angle, corner," is itself a loan-word from Venet. *canton*, *idem*.[5] As the *dragante* is of triangular form, *τρικάντουνον*, semantically, fits this denomination; neither does it present any difficulty phonetically. But there are chronological difficulties.[6] The Ital. nautical term is attested as early as 1246 in a Medieval Lat. text of Genoa: *tragant* "legno che si poneva a mo' di croce sulla cima del capione di prora della galera";[7] this form shows already the assimilation of the protonic *i* > *a*, and the weakening of *k* > *g* before *a*. Such phonetical changes presuppose an earlier date of borrowing than that of the first appearance of the nautical term in Genoa, and furthermore presuppose, certainly, an early borrowing of Ital. *canton* by Greek. If *καντούνι* "angle, corner" was so familiar in Gr. that it could be used in Gr. compounds, such as *τρικάντουνον*, it must have been borrowed at least

[1] The first article of the series, "Italo-byzantinische Etymologien: *scala*" was published in *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* XVI (1939/40), 33–58.

[2] *Dizionario di marina medievale e moderno* (Rome, 1937), p. 232.

[3] *Storia delle parole marinaresche italiane passate in francese* (Florence, 1939), pp. 342–345. Vidos gives a bibliography of the question.

[4] Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, No. 2759 *s.v.* draco.

[5] Boerio, *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano* (Venice, 1829), *s.v.*

[6] Cf. Kahane, "Zur neugriechischen Seemannssprache," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* XV (1939), 97 f.

[7] Vidos, *op. cit.*, p. 343 and n. 2.

in the twelfth c.: for it appears in Ital. form in the first half of the thirteenth century. Τρικάντουνος "trigonus," *τρικάντουνον* "triangulum" are first registered by Du Cange,[8] but without any reference to a Middle Gr. text; they are found nowadays in the dialects of the Aegean Islands (Thera, Naxos, Sikinos, Syros), Samos, and Eastern Thrace (Ainos).[9] The simple *καντούνι* n. "angle, corner" appears, according to Triandaphyllidis,[10] in Middle Gr., but the record is given without any chronological indication. The earliest record of the Venet. loan-word occurs, as far as I see, in the Cyprian Chronicle of Makhairas (middle of the fifteenth century), where the compound *τετρακάντουνος* means "(a brazier) with four corners."[11] Even if from a fifteenth-century *τετρακάντουνος* we may infer an analogical compound *τρικάντουνον* for the same century, we are still three centuries away from the hypothetical point of departure. The real difficulty, however, consists in the fact that such a familiarity as *καντούνι* shows, can hardly be assumed for an Italianism as early as the twelfth century.

If therefore the derivation of Ital. *dragante* from Gr. *τρικάντουνον* is not probable, Vidos, on the other hand, seems to be right in advocating Gr. origin of the Ital. nautical term: the basis is, I believe, not a Gr. Italianism, but a genuine Gr. word: **τρικάνθιον* or, rather, **τρικάνθιν*[12] s.n. This Middle Gr. word is a compound of Gr. *τρι-* "three-," and Gr. *κανθός* in the meaning "angle, corner." From the standpoint of Romance linguistics there is no semantic difference between *τρικάντουνον* and **τρικάνθιν*; and, since the whole word is of Gr. origin, the chronological difficulties of Vidos' hypothesis, connected with the phenomenon of a *rückwanderer*, are eliminated. Three questions arise, two from the standpoint of Greek, and one from that of Ital. linguistics: 1. a semantical one: has Middle Gr. *κανθός* assumed the meaning "angle, corner"? 2. a morphological one: is such a formation as **τρικάνθιν* possible in Middle Greek? 3. a phonetical one: was,

[8] *Glossarium mediae ed infimae graecitatis* (1688) I, 578.

[9] Kahane, *Italienische Ortsnamen in Griechenland* (Athens, 1940), p. 85 f.

[10] *Die Lehnwörter in der mittelgriechischen Vulgärliteratur* (Strassburg, 1907), p. 136.

[11] Ed. by R. M. Dawkins (Oxford, 1932), Glossary *s.v.*

[12] The *-o-* of the neutra in *-ιον* disappeared as early as the 3d c. B.C., but was often restored by Byzantine authors, cf. Psaltes, *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken* (Göttingen, 1913), §§ 94–96.

in the twelfth or thirteenth c., the Ital. explosive *t* substituted for the Gr. spirant *θ*?

1. The semantical problem

Ancient Gr. *κανθός* m. "corner of the eye" is attested from the fourth c. B.C. to the sixth/seventh c. A.D., and poetically as "eye," from the 4th c. B.C. to the sixth c. A.D.[13] But *κανθός* must have survived, as is shown by the existence of the word in Modern Greek. The usual form of the word in Modern Gr. is *ἀγκαθός* m., with *α*-prothesis and change of *k* > *ng* under folk-etymological influence of Gr. *ἀγκάθι* "thorn." From the modern Gr. dialects only one seems to preserve the word in the Ancient Gr. meaning: Syme, *ἀκατθός* m. "corner of the eye towards the temples," whereas elsewhere in Greece the connection with the eye was dropped and stress was laid on the meaning "corner" [14] from which secondary meanings developed: General nautical term: "rabbet" (*ἀγαθός*).[15] Dialectical records: "inside corner of the house" (Melos: *ἀγκαθός*); "point of any cubical or parallelepiped body, and generally the external corner of any body, e.g. of a stone, of a loaf of bread" (Leucas: *ἀγκαθός*; Crete: *gαθός*; Syros [Hermoupolis]: *ἀγαθός*; Megiste: *ἀγκαθθός*; Acarnania: *ἀγκαθός*; Northern Euboea: *ἀγαθός*); "point, end of the keel of a ship" (Megiste: *ἀγκαθθός*); "pointed end; point" (Northern Euboea: *ἀγαθός*; Macedonia: *ἀγαθός*); "steep rock; cliff" (Samothrace: *ἀγκαθός*); "ridge of a mountain" (Syme: *ἀκατθός*).[16] These records which are scattered all over Greece give evidence that Middle Gr. *κανθός* had assumed the meaning "angle, corner."

2. The morphological problem

In Middle Greek, the type **τρικάνθιν* could be formed from *κανθός*, as shown by the parallel compound expressions in *-ιος* or

[13] Liddell-Scott; *CGL* II 17, 47; 338, 28; 390, 55; III 85, 35; 349, 26; 394, 31.

[14] E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 3d ed. (Heidelberg-Paris, 1938), p. 406 *s.v. κανθός*: "le sens prim. est 'fléchissement, courbure,' cf. *κανθώδης* 'courbe, recourbé.'"

[15] Palaskas, *Γαλλοελληνικὸν λεξικὸν τῶν ναυτικῶν ὅρων* (Athens, 1898–1908), *s.v.* râblure.

[16] *Ἱστορικὸν λεξικὸν τῆς νέας ἑλληνικῆς* (*Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν*), Athens, 1933 ff., I, 130.

-ιον whose first element is a numeral. Some examples, arranged according to the numeral prefixes, follow:[17]

μονο — compounds

ἡμέρα "day": μονημέριον s.n. "spectacle lasting for one day," *Anthologia Palatina (in lemmate)*, Justinianus, *Novellae* (6th c. A.D.); cf. the adj. ἡμέριος "lasting but a day," Papyrus (6th c. A.D.).

κίων "pillar, column": Μονοκιόνιον [meaning "a single column"] "a place at Constantinople," Stephanus Diaconus (9th c.).[18]

μαλλός "wool, hair": μονομάλλιος adj. "of pure wool," Theophanes continuatus (9th/10th c.),[19] Constantinus Porphyrogenitus (10th c.);[20] cf. μονόμαλλος adj. *idem*, Papyrus (3d/4th c. A.D.).

μονήρης s.f. "a galley with one man to each oar,"[21] Leo, *Tactica* (probably 8th c.):[22] μονήριον s.n. "a galley with one bank of oars," Leo, *Tactica* (probably 8th c.), Theophanes continuatus (9th/10th c.);[23] μονέριον *idem*, Leo Diaconus (end of the 10th c.).[24]

πτυχή "fold": μονοπτύχιος adj. "folding once," Papyrus (6th c. A.D.); cf. the adj. πτύχιος "folded," *Etymologicum magnum*.

πύργος "tower": μονοπύργιον s.n. "fortress with one tower only," Procopius (6th c. A.D.).

χορδή "string": μονοχόρδιον s.n. "monochord," *Codex Graecobarbarus* (Vulgargr. paraphrase of the *Historia* of Nicetas Choniates, written in the 13th c. or later);[25] cf. μονόχορδον s.n. *idem*, Pollux (2nd c. A.D.) etc.

ᾠδή "song": *monodium* s.n. "the song of a solo-singer," Diomedes (Latin Grammarian of the second half of the 4th c. A.D.); cf. μονῳδία "monody, solo," Aristophanes (5th/4th c. B.C.) etc.

δι — compounds

ἄρμενον "sail of a vessel": διαρμένιος adj. "with two sails, as a vessel," Synesius (4th/5th c. A.D.).[26]

[17] When not stated otherwise, the quotations are taken from Liddell-Scott's Greek dictionary. -ιον formations with dimin. character have not been, of course, registered in the following list.

[18] Sophocles *s.v.*

[19] Psaltes § 251.

[20] Psaltes §§ 251, 501.

[21] The noun is based on the adj. μονήρης "of a ship, with one man to each oar," Pollux (2nd c. A.D.), Procopius (6th c. A.D.). Cf. the parallel formations τριήρης s.f., πεντήρης s.f. etc. The termin. -ήρης from ἐρε-, Boisacq, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

[22] Henricus Stephanus *s.v.* μονήριον.

[23] Sophocles *s.v.*

[24] Du Cange *s.v.*

[25] Du Cange *s.v.*; Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (Niort, 1883–1887), *s.v.* monochordum. — Nicetas Choniates, ed. Bonn., 1835, p. 454, 25: μονοκόρδιον.

[26] Sophocles *s.v.*

δάκτυλος "finger": διδακτύλιος adj. "two fingers long or broad," Cedrenus (11th/12th c.);[27] cf. διδακτυλιαῖος adj. *idem*, Sextus Empiricus (2nd c. A.D.), Heliodorus Medicus (1st/2nd c. A.D.) etc., and διδάκτυλος adj. *idem*, Hippocrates (5th c. B.C.) etc.

δίκρανον s.n. "pitch fork," Lucian (2nd c. A.D.) etc., δίκρανος s.f. "furcula"; "furca," *Gloss.* (3d c. A.D.; 6th/7th c. A.D.):[28] δικράνιον s.n. "furca," *Passio S. Romani* (probably 4th c. A.D.).[29]

ἕδρα "seat": διέδριον s.n. "seat for two persons," *Gloss.* (from the 3d c. A.D. on),[30] Anonymus apud Suidam; cf. δίεδρον s.n. *idem*, Papyrus (3d c. B.C.).[31]

ἵππος "horse": Δίππιον s.n. "Duo equi (statua repraesentati) [Constantinopolitan place-name]," Theophanes (begin. of the 9th c.),[32] Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.),[33] Theodosius Melitenus (second half of the 10th c.),[34] Codinus, *Patria* (end of the 10th c.),[35] Joannes Zonaras (first half of the 12th c.),[36] Nicetas Choniates (end of the 12th c./begin. of the 13th c.);[37] cf. διιππον· biga, *Glossae Graeco-Latinae* (6th/7th c. A.D.).[38]

κίων "pillar, column": δικιόνιον s.n. "having two pillars," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.).[39]

κοτύλη "measure": δικοτύλιον s.n. "measure of two κοτύλαι," Oribasius (6th c. A.D.); cf. δικότυλον s.n. *idem*, Papyrus (3d c. A.D.).

λαβή "handle": διλάβιον s.n. "forceps," *Diploma* (ca. 1135); "pair of fire-tongs," *Glossae Reg. Cod. 2062.*[40]

οὖς "ear": διώτιν s.n. "two-handled vessel," Ptochoprodromus (12th c.).[41] Cf. the adj. δίωτος "of vessels, two-handled," Plato (5th/4th c. B.C.) etc.

πύργος "tower": *διπύργιος adj. "with two wings," in διπυργία οἰκία "house with two wings," Papyrus (1st c. A.D.), Papyrus (3d c. A.D.), etc.; cf. διπυργιαία *idem*, Papyrus (3d c. A.D.).

σκέλος "leg": δισκέλιον s.n. "a frame with two legs," Leo, *Tactica* (probahly 8th c.).[42]

[27] Sophocles *s.v.*
[28] *CGL* III 263, 2; II 277, 42.
[29] *Analecta Bollandiana* L (1932), 257; concerning date, *ibidem*, p. 275.
[30] *CGL* III 321, 15; 492, 20; 514, 41; II 30, 21.
[31] E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, 2nd ed. (Berlin-Leipzig, 1936–), Bd. I: Laut- und Wortlehre, 3. Teil: Stammbildung, p. 158.
[32] Psaltes § 404.
[33] Psaltes § 502.
[34] Psaltes § 502.
[35] Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*
[36] Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*
[37] Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*
[38] *CGL* II 277, 11. In the *Hermeneumata Leidensia* (3d c. A.D.) (*CGL* III 11, 7) the type: di, ἵππιν· unga.
[39] Sophocles *s.v.*
[40] Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*
[41] Koraes, Ἄτακτα (Paris, 1828–35), I, 28, l. 379. — For the formation cf. *monotion*· orciolus, presumably "a little pitcher with one handle," in the *Hermeneumata Monacensia* (3d c. A.D.), *CGL* III 194, 10.
[42] Sophocles *s.v.*

ταγή "ration": διτάγιον s.n. "double ration," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.).[43]

φύλλον "leaf": διφύλλιον s.n. "two leaved pamphlet," *Concilium Constantinopolitanum* (a. 680).[44]

ᾠδή "ode, in the ritual": διῴδιον s.n. "cantus qui duabus odis constat," *Menologium*.[45]

τρι — compounds

ἄρμενον "sail of a vessel": τριαρμένιος adj. "with three sails," Nicetas Choniates (end of the 12th/begin. of the 13th c.);[46] cf. τριάρμενος adj. "with three sails or masts," Plutarch (1st/2nd c. A.D.), Lucian (2nd c. A.D.).

ἵππος "horse": τριΐππιν· triga, *Hermeneumata Leidensia* (3d c. A.D.);[47] cf. τριΐππον· triga, *Glossae Graeco-Latinae* (6th/7th c. A.D.).[48]

κῶλον "limb, member": τρικώλιος adj. "three-limbed, i.e., three pronged," Inscription of Cos (4th/3d c. B.C.).

λέξις "word": τριλέξιον s.n. "a kind of song," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.).[49]

ὁδός "road": τριόδιον s.n. "a meeting of three roads," Antiatticista (2nd c. A.D.),[50] Papyrus (3d/4th c. A.D.);[51] cf. τρίοδος s.f. *idem*, Theognis (6th c. B.C.) etc.

ὀδούς "tooth": τριόδους s.m. "trident," Pindar (5th c. B.C.) etc.: τριοδόντιον· (besides τρίαινα) tridens, *Glossae Latino-Graecae* (date?);[52] *triodontin'* fuscina, *Glossae Servii Grammatici* (8th c.?).[53]

πούς "foot": τριπόδιος adj. "three-footed," Papyrus (3d c. B.C.).

πύλη "gate": τριπύλιος adj., in τριοδίτης τριπύλιος, title of Menippean Satire by Varro (1st c. B.C.).

σκέλος "leg": τρισκέλιον s.n. "a frame with three legs," Leo, *Tactica* (probably 8th c.).[54]

ταγή "ration": τριτάγιον s.n. "three feeds or shares," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.).[55]

τρίβολος "caltrop, i.e., a four-spiked implement thrown on the ground to lame the enemy's horses," from Philo Mechanicus (3d/2nd c. B.C.) to Procopius (6th c. A.D.): τριβόλιον s.n. "murex ferreus," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.).[56]

[43] Psaltes § 501; Sophocles *s.v.*
[44] Sophocles *s.v.*
[45] Meursius, *Glossarium Graeco-barbarum* (1614), cf. Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*
[46] Ed. Bonn., 1835, p. 223, 24.
[47] *CGL* III 11, 8.
[48] *CGL* II 459, 11.
[49] Psaltes § 502; Sophocles *s.v.* For meaning cf. *Constantinus Porphyrogenitus*, ed. Bonn., II, 152, 296.
[50] Concerning date cf. K. Latte, *Hermes* L (1915), 393.
[51] F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin, 1925 ff.), p. 617.
[52] *CGL* II 201, 43.
[53] *CGL* II 522, 41; cf. *RE s.v.* Servius.
[54] Sophocles *s.v.*
[55] Psaltes § 501; Sophocles *s.v.*
[56] Psaltes § 504.

φύλλον "leaf": τριφύλλιον s.n. "trefoil, clover,"[57] Aretaeus (second half of the 2nd c. A.D.), *Scholia in Homeri Odysseam* δ 603 (14th c.);[58] cf. τρίφυλλον s.n. "clover, *trifolium fragiferum*," Herodotus (5th c. B.C.) etc.

χαλκός "copper money": *τριχάλκιος adj. "of three χαλκοῖ," in τριχαλκία (ὠνή) f. "tax of three χαλκοῖ," Papyrus (3d c. B.C.).[59]

ᾠδή "ode, in the ritual": τριῴδιον s.n. "a κανών consisting of three ᾠδαί," Theodorus Studites (end of the 8th/begin. of the 9th c.), Michael Monachus (9th c.) etc.[60]

ὥρα "hour": *trihorium* s.n. "three hours," Ausonius (4th c. A.D.).[61]

τετρα — compounds

ἀοιδή "song": τεταροίδιος adj. "of four notes, in Music, name of a Νόμος of Terpander," Plutarch (1st/2nd c. A.D.).[62]

κίων "pillar, column": τετρακιόνιον s.n. "shrine with four pillars," Pausanias Damascenus (4th c. A.D.); τετρακιόνιν s.n. "monument with four columns," Malalas (6th c.), Epiphanius Monachus (begin. of the 9th c.).[63]

μήν "month": τετραμήνιος adj. "lasting four months," Papyrus (3d c. A.D.); cf. the older types τετράμηνος adj. *idem*, Thucydides (5th c. B.C.), τεταμηνιαῖος adj. *idem*, Diodorus Siculus (1st c. B.C.).

πούς "foot": (a) τετραπόδιον s.n. "quadruped, beast," *Martyrium S. Placidae seu S. Eustathii*;[64] cf. the type τετράποδον s.n. *idem*, Papyrus (a. 256 B.C.).[65] — (b) τετραπόδιον s.n. "mensa quadrupes, in qua panis cum frumento, vinum et oleum benedicenda offeruntur . . . vel etiam ad alios usus ecclesiasticos," *Typicum S. Sabae* (written a. 524 A.D., revised in Constantinople in the 12th and 13th c.[66]), *Euchologium*, and Philotheos Kokkinos (14th c.).[67, 68]

[57] For the many cases in which -ιον was used, for different reasons, as a plant suffix, cf. W. Petersen, *Greek Diminutives in -ιον* (Weimar, 1910), pp. 185–190.

[58] Cf. Schrader, *Hermes* XXII (1887), 337.

[59] Mayser I 3, p. 185.

[60] Sophocles *s.v.*; Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*; Du Cange *s.v.*

[61] Liddell-Scott, *s.v.* τριώριον, suggest *trihorium* to be a Greek word in Latin dress because its second element is Greek; but cf. Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. 34, n. 1.

[62] For further passages cf. H. Weil — Th. Reinach, *Plutarque, De la musique* (Paris, 1900), p. 18, n. 44.

[63] Psaltes § 502; Sophocles *s.v.*

[64] Du Cange *s.v.* with the erroneous definition "abacus"; the passage runs as follows: ὑπερβάλλων πάντας τοὺς ἐνδόξους, ἔν τε κτήμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ καὶ ἀργυρίῳ καὶ τετραποδίοις καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ περιουσίᾳ; Migne, *Patr. Gr.* CV, 378, gives the variant ἀνδραπόδοις [ἀνδράποδον "slave"] instead of Du Cange's τετραποδίοις. — S. Eustathius died a. 118 in Rome. The *S. Eustathii et sociorum acta antiqua* (ed. Migne, *Patr. Gr.* CV, 375–418) are mentioned in A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig, 1893–1904), I, 2, p. 825 under *Verdächtiges und Unechtes*. These *acta* were the source for Nicetas David's (9th c.) *Oratio in laudem S. Eustathii* (Migne, *loc. cit.*).

[65] Mayser I 3, p. 158.

[66] *Byz. Z.* III (1894), 167 f.

[67] Du Cange *s.v.*

[68] τετραπόδιον s.n. "table with four feet" was probably formed after the numeral compound τριπόδιον s.n. "that which has three feet," "a tripod," originally a dim. of τρίπους; cf. below n. 95.

πύργος "tower": τετραπύργιος adj. "with four towers," Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* [si vera lectio] (1st c. A.D.); Damascius (5th/6th c. A.D.); cf. the f. noun τετραπυργία "building with four towers, fortified country house," Plutarch (1st/2nd c. A.D.) and as a place-name from the 2nd c. B.C. to the 6th c. A.D.[68]

ᾠδή "ode, in the ritual": τετραῴδιον s.n. "in the ritual, a κανών consisting of four ᾠδαί," Theophanes Continuatus (9th/10th c.), Leo Grammaticus (11th c.), Cedrenus (11th/12th c.), Michael Glycas (12th c.), Ephraem (begin. of the 14th c.).[70]

πεντα — *compounds*

ἔτος "year": πενταέτιος adj. "five years old," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.);[71] the Ancient Gr. adj. is πενταετής or πενταέτης *idem*, Herodotus (5th c. B.C.) etc.

μήν "month": πενταμήνιος adj. "five months old," Papyrus (2nd c. A.D.); cf. πεντάμηνος adj. *idem*, Aristotle (4th c. B.C.) etc., and πενταμηνιαῖος adj. *idem*, Bithynian Epigramma, and Apsyrtus (4th c. A.D.).

πύργος "tower": πενταπύργιον s.n. "shrine with five turrets," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.).[72]

ἑξα — *compounds*

ἔτος "year": ἑξαέτιος adj. "six years old," Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.);[73] cf. ἑξαετής or ἑξαέτης adj. *idem*, Greek inscription (date?), Papyrus (date?), Josephus (1st c. A.D.).

ἵππος "horse": Ἑξαΐππιον s.n. "Constantinopolitan place-name," Malalas (6th c.), *Chronicon Paschale* (7th c.);[74] cf. εξαΐππον· sexiuges, *Hermeneumata Leidensia* (3d c. A.D.),[75] Εξαΐππον· seiuga, *Glossae Graeco-Latinae* (6th/7th c. A.D.).[76]

κίων "pillar, column": Ἑξακιόνιον s.n. "place near Constantinople," Theophanes (9th c.), Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th c.), Codinus, *Patria* (end of the 10th c.).[77]

[68] Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*

[70] Psaltes § 502; Sophocles *s.v.*; Henricus Stephanus *s.v.*

[71] Psaltes § 501; Sophocles *s.v.*

[72] Psaltes § 503.

[73] Psaltes § 501; Sophocles *s.v.*

[74] Psaltes § 404.

[75] *CGL* III 11, 10.

[76] *CGL* II 301, 29.

[77] Sophocles *s.v.* Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, ed. Bonn., vol. I, p. 56, 1; p. 105, 20. Cf. Dawkins, "The Place-names of Later Greece," *Transactions of the Philological Society* [London], 1933, p. 33: "The Greeks called it *Exokionion*, Ἐξωκιόνιον 'the Outside Column,' because it was outside the Constantinian wall and was adorned by a notable column. Later the Greeks corrupted the name to *Exakionion* Ἑξακιόνιον, 'the Place of Six Columns,' and of this the Turks, or more probably Turkish-speaking Greeks, made the translation *Alty Mermer*, 'the Six Marbles.'" — Ἐξωκιονῖται m. pl. was an epithet given to the Arians in the reign of Theodosius the Great, because they used to hold their religious meetings at Ἐξωκιόνιον, as they were not allowed to have churches within the walls of Constantinople; the corrupted type ἑξακιονῖται in Theodoret (5th c. A.D.) and Malalas (6th c.); for further references cf. Sophocles *s.v.* Ἑξακιονῖται; Du Cange *s.v.* ἐξωκιονῖται.

ἑπτα — compounds

λόφος "hill": ἑπταλόφιον s.n. "septimontium," *Hermeneumata Monacensia* (3d c. A.D.).[78]

μήν "month": ἑπταμήνιος adj. "born in the seventh month," in the *Theologumena Arithmetica* of Iamblichus (4th c. A.D.); cf. ἑπτάμηνος adj. *idem*, Hippocrates (5th c. B.C.) etc., ἑπταμηνιαῖος adj. *idem*, Cicero (1st c. B.C.) etc.

ὄρος "mountain": ἑπταόριον s.n. "septimontium," *Glossae Graeco-Latinae* (6th/7th c.).[79]

ὀκτα — compound

πούς "foot": ὀκτάπους s.m. "*octopus vulgaris*," *Gloss.* (3d c. A.D.; 6th/7th c. A.D.),[80] Alexander Trallianus (6th c. A.D.): ὀκταπόδιον s.n. *idem*, Joannes Tzetezes, *Scholia in Oppianum* (12th c.),[81] Anonymous ms. in *Methodo de urinis*;[82] ὀκταπόδιν s.n. *idem*, Vulgargr. paraphrase of the *Historia* of Nicetas Choniates (13th c. or later);[83] ὀκταπόδιον s.n. = ὀκτάγλωσσον, "a banner, a flag," Codinus, *De Officiis* (middle of the 14th c.).[84]

ἐννεα — compound

ὥρα "hour": ἐννεαώριον s.n. "space of time of nine hours," Theodorus Studites (end of the 8th/begin. of the 9th c.).[85]

δωδεκα — compounds

δραχμή "a silver-coin": *δωδεκαδράχμιος adj. "of twelve drachmae," δωδεκαδραχμία (ὠνή) "tax of twelve drachmae," Papyrus (3d c. B.C.), Papyrus (a. 28 B.C.),[86] and substantivized, δωδεκαδραχμία f. *idem*, Papyri (3d c. B.C.; 1st c. B.C.);[87] cf. δωδεκάδραχμος adj. "sold at twelve drachmae," Demosthenes (4th c. B.C.), "privileged to pay as poll-tax only twelve drachmae," Papyrus (1st c. A.D.).

χαλκός "copper money": *δωδεκαχάλκιος adj. "of twelve χαλκοῖ," δωδεκαχαλκία (ὠνή) "tax of twelve χαλκοῖ," Papyrus (3d c. B.C.);[88] and substantivized, δωδεκαχαλκία f. *idem*, Papyrus (3d c. B.C.).[89]

[78] *CGL* III 171, 40.

[79] *CGL* II 313, 38 var.

[80] *CGL* III 186, 61; 256, 58; 355, 53; II 381, 40.

[81] Ed. U. C. Bussemaker (Paris, 1849), I, 306: Πουλύποδες· λέγω, τὰ ὀκταπόδια. In this passage ὀκταπόδιον does not imply any dim. sense; it may, however, have originated from a type ὀκταπόδιον, where -ιον was used as a suffix of descent designating the young of animals; cf. πολύπους: πολυπόδιον "a young polyp," Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

[82] Du Cange *s.v.*

[83] Ed. Bonn., 1835, p. 303, 24.

[84] Ed. Bonn., 1839, p. 48, 2. For the semantical development cf. *ibidem*, p. 285.

[85] Ed. Migne, *Patr. Gr.* XCIX, 917 B.

[86] Mayser I 3, p. 183.

[87] Mayser I 3, p. 36. — Cf. the substantivized adjectives μονοδραχμία f. "tax of 1 drachma," Papyri (3d c. B.C.), ἑξαδραχμία f. "tax of six drachmae," Papyri (1st c. B.C.; 2nd c. A.D.).

[88] Mayser I 3, p. 185.

[89] Mayser I 3, p. 36. Cf. above s. τρι-: τριχαλκία.

ὥρα "hour": δωδεκαώριον s.n. "space of time of twelve hours," Theodorus Studites (end of the 8th/begin. of the 9th c.).[90]

According to the rules of Greek word formation, a type like *τρικάνθιν could be produced in three ways: 1. κανθός: *τρικάνθιος adj.; *τρικάνθιον adj. n.: *τρικάνθιον s.n. "(piece of wood) with three corners." In analogy to Ancient or Middle Gr. compounds in -ιος from words with the ending -ιος, or -ία, or -ιον several bahuvrihi were formed in Middle Gr. with the ending -ιος, instead of the expected ending -ος or -ης.[91] From these compound adjectives in -ιος new neuter nouns were derived, so to speak *erstarrte neutra* in -ιον.[92] 2. κανθός: *τρικάνθιον s.n. In analogy to the many *erstarrte neutra* new neuter compounds in -ιον were formed, without presupposing the intermediate stage of an adj. in -ιος.[93] 3. κανθός: *τρίκανθος s.m.: *τρικάνθιον s.n. From already existing common compounds new neuter nouns could develop which should be regarded rather as *parasyntheta* than as *syntheta*.[94] In the following list I present the same examples, but this time arranged according to the three ways of word formation; the order within the groups is a chronological one; only the first record is mentioned.

1. 4th/3d c. B.C. τρικώλιος. 3d c. B.C. τριπόδιος, τριχάλκιος. δωδεκαχάλκιος, δωδεκαδράχμιος. 1st c. B.C. τριπύλιος. 1st c. A.D. διπύργιος, τετραπύργιος. 1st/2nd c. A.D. τετραοίδιος. 2nd c. πενταμήνιος. 3d c. τετραμήνιος. 4th c. ἑπταμήνιος. 4th/5th c. διαρμένιος. 6th c. μονοπτύχιος. 9th/10th c. μονομάλλιος. 10th c. πενταέτιος, ἑξαέτιος. 11th/12th c. διδακτύλιος. 12th/13th c. τριαρμένιος.

2. 2nd c. A.D. τριόδιον, τριφύλλιον. 3d c. διέδριον, ἑπταλόφιον, τριΐππιν. 4th c. *trihorium*, *monodium*, τετρακιόνιν. *5th c. ἑξακιόνιον. 6th c. μονοπύργιον, μονημέριον, ἑξαΐππιον, δικοτύλιον. 6th/7th c. ἑπταόριον. 7th c. διφύλλιον. 8th c. δισκέλιον, τρισκέλιον. 8th/9th c. τριῴδιον, ἐννεώριον, δωδεκαώριον. 9th c. μονοκιόνιον, διΐππιον. 9th/10th c. διῴδιον, τετραῴδιον. 10th c. δικιόνιον, πενταπύργιον, διτάγιον, τριτάγιον, τριλέξιον. 12th c. διλάβιον, διώτιν. 12th/13th c. τετραπόδιον. 13th c. or later μονοχόρδιον.

3. 4th c. A.D. δικράνιον. 5th c. [?] τριοδόντιον. 8th c. μονήριον. 10th c. τριβόλιον. 12th c. ὀκταπόδιον.

The first of the three groups which presupposes an intermediate adjective between the primitive noun and the compound noun seems to have been always alive: the examples are found from the 4th c. B.C. on. — The second group, however, which presents

[90] Ed. Migne, *Patr. Gr.* XCIX, p. 917 C.
[91] Psaltes § 501.
[92] Psaltes § 502.
[93] Psaltes § 503.
[94] Psaltes § 504.

a direct derivation of the compound noun from the primitive noun, seems to have originated rather late, in the 2nd c. A.D.;[95] and the later the examples appear, the more numerous they are. Several facts suggest that this type of derivation: numeral-prefix + noun + suffix *-ιον* may owe its existence to Latin influence: in Latin, this formation was old and popular;[96] in Gr. there are some early records of Latin loan-words of this type;[97] and some examples of Gr. loan-translations.[98] — The third group offers only isolated examples.

[95] The examples which appear before the 2nd c. A.D., and which seemingly belong to this kind of formation, should, I think, for different reasons, be eliminated. P. Chantraine, *La Formation des Noms en Grec ancien* (Collection linguistique p.p. La Société de Linguistique de Paris XXXVIII), Paris, 1933, p. 57, states that there is "un certain nombre de composés avec des noms de nombre: les mots du type *τριπόδιον* 'trépied' (Antiphane [4th c. B.C.]), cf. *τρίπους* sont rares": but even this example may not belong to this class; it seems to be a diminutive derivative from *τρίπους*, as shown by context of the different passages (Liddell-Scott *s.v.*; cf. Mayser I 3, p. 41), and by the parallelism of *τριπόδιον* and *τριποδίσκος* (*RE* V, 1678; W. Petersen, "The Greek diminutive suffix *-ισκο- -ισκη-*," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* XVIII [1913], § 67). — Petersen, *Greek Diminutives in -ιον*, pp. 34, 160, points out the diminutive nuance of *τρικλίνιον*. — Concerning *διλήμνιον* "double lemniscus," it is difficult to retrace the way of derivation, the basis being obscure; but the existence of both *λημνίσκος* "woollen fillet or ribbon" and *διλήμνιον* seems to presuppose a type **λήμνιον* (cf. Petersen, "The Gr. dim. suff. *-ισκο- -ισκη-*," p. 186 f.). — *διλέσβιον* "a double Lesbian pitcher," Papyri (3d c. B.C.) [Mayser I 3, p. 47] seems to be a direct derivative from *λέσβιον* "drinking cup," Hedyle Epigrammatica (3d c. B.C.). — *τετραπέδιον* "rectangle," appears in Hero Mechanicus' *Stereometrica* (ed. J. L. Heiberg, Leipzig, 1914, V, Index); *τετρασίριον* s.n. "quadrangular barn, granary," in his *De Mensuris* (ed. J. L. Heiberg, Leipzig, 1914, V, Index) [whereas a much smaller granary is called *τετράσειρον* in the *Stereometrica*]: the period of the author as well as the history of both texts are completely uncertain.

[96] F. T. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* (New York, 1895), § 76; and the Latin Grammars of Stolz I 2, pp. 389 ff., 415; and of Stolz-Schmalz (ed. Leumann-Hofmann), p. 210, No. 4.

[97] The earliest examples seem to be: *διπούντιον*, *διπούνδιον* s. n. "a Roman coin" (end of the 1st c. A.D.; end of the 2nd c. A.D.; 6th c.) < Lat. *dipundium*, a variant of *dupondium*; cf. F. Hultsch, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1864), p. 173; F. Hultsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie* (Berlin, 1862), p. 11 f.; Joannes Laurentius Lydus, *Liber de Mensibus*, ed. R. Wünsch (Leipzig, 1898), p. 173, 17; *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* V, 2285. — *δισάκκιον* s.n. "saddle-bag, panniers" (2nd and 3d c. A.D.) < Lat. *bisaccium* (Petronius), cf. G. Meyer, "Neugriechische Studien III," *SAWien*, CXXXII (Vienna, 1895), p. 15 f.; W. Heraeus, *Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen*, Programm (Offenbach, 1899), p. 3.

[98] Some examples, arranged according to their first appearance: *τριόδιον* (2nd c. A.D.) after Lat. *trivium* (Cicero, 1st c. B.C.); *τριφύλλιον* (2nd c. A.D.) after Lat. *trifolium* (Plinius, 1st c. A.D.); cf. also Petersen, *Greek diminutives in -ιον*, p. 34;

The frequency of the examples of group 2 in Middle Greek makes it probable that **τρικάνθιν* has been derived directly from *κανθός*.

3. The phonetical problem

In Vulg. Lat., Gr. *θ* [99] is rendered by *t*.[100] It seems that in later periods Gr. *θ* was replaced in Romanic loan-words in two ways, either by *s* or by *t*.[101] I have not material of dated Gr. loan-words, borrowed at the same time as **τρικάνθιν*, i.e. in the 12th or 13th century; but there are Romanic (or Middle Lat.) forms of Gr. place-names of that period which show that Gr. *θ* was heard by Frankish ears also as *t*. Certainly, the single place-name can not indicate much, since questions of spelling or folk-etymological influence interfere in a high degree; their totality, however, is large enough to prove the Romanic *t*-substitute and, with it, the phonetical possibility of the development Middle Gr. **τρικάνθιν* > Old Gen. **trigant*. The following examples cover the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries; they are taken from portolanos, chronicles, and documents, especially from "that *locus classicus* for Frankish names, the [Venetian] list of depredations by pirates in Greece, drawn up in 1278." [102]

διέδριον (3d c. A.D.) after Lat. *bisellium* (Varro, 1st c. B.C.); cf. Petersen, *loc. cit.*; *ἑπταλόφιον* (3d c. A.D.), *ἑπταόριον* (6th/7th c. A.D.) after Lat. *Septimontium* (Varro, 1st c. B.C.).

[99] In Middle Gr. the nasal of the cluster *νθ* was assimilated to the following consonant, and such pronunciation *θθ* still exists in some Modern Gr. dialects (e.g., in Cyprus and the Dodecanese), whereas in the general language *θθ* was simplified to *θ*. This process, however, which can be observed since the period of the Roman Empire (Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* I [Munich, 1939], p. 216; K. Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* [Leipzig, 1898], p. 115 f.), was not fully accomplished in Middle Gr. (Psaltes § 209).

[100] Schwyzer, *op. cit.*, p. 158. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* I (Leipzig, 1890), § 17.

[101] Some material for the pronunciation of Gr. *θ* as Romanic *t* is offered in the cases of *θεῖος* > **tiu* (P. Aebischer, *Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* [Lettere, Storia e Filosofia], ser. II, vol. V [1936], 217–221); *ἀποθήκη* > **botica* (Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, No. 531; Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Bonn, 1928 ff.], I, 106; V. de Bartholomaeis, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* XV [1901], 353; Menéndez Pidal, *Manual de gramática histórica española*, 6th ed. [Madrid, 1941], § 4, 2; Claussen, *Romanische Forschungen* XV [1904], 85 n. 1); *κιθάρα* > **chitara* (Meyer-Lübke, *Roman. etymol. Wb.*, No. 1953; Menéndez Pidal, *loc. cit.*; Rohlfs, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der unteritalienischen Gräzität* [Halle, 1930], No. 997; on the other hand, Wartburg, *op. cit.*, II, 719); for Southern Italy: Rohlfs, *op. cit.*, p. XLV.

[102] W. Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient* (Cambridge, 1921), p. 108 n. 6.

Ἀγαθόπολις. 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Gatopolli*;[103] a. 1311–1320 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Gatopolli*;[104] a. 1367 (map of the Venetians Pizigano): *Gatopoli*;[105] a. 1375 (Catalan map): *Gatapoli*;[106] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Gatapoli*.[107]

Ἀθῆναι. a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *Satine*;[108] a. 1317 (French doc.) *Ducaume de Staines*;[109] c. 1325 (Catal. chronicle of Muntaner): *duch de Tenes, ducat de Tenes*;[110] a. 1330 (Catal. doc.): *Cetines*;[111] a. 1379 (letter of the Queen of Aragon): *Santa Maria de Setines*;[112] a. 1380 (Catal. doc.): *castell de Cetines*;[113] a. 1387 (Greek doc.): Νικόλαος δὲ Ἀτέναις;[114] a. 1388 (Ital. letter): *lo chastello di Settino*;[115] end of the 14th c. (*Libro de los Fechos*, the Aragonese version of the *Chronicle of Morea*): *Cetinas*.[116]

Ἀθύρας. Begin. of the 13th c. (Geoffroi de Ville-Hardouin): *Nature*,[117] *Nanture*;[118] 13th c. (*La Cronique des Veniciens* de Maistre Martin da Canal): *Nature*;[119] a. 1311–20 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Natura*;[120] a. 1362 *et seqq.* (Papal documents): *Naturensis* [adjective];[121] a. 1375 (Catal. map): *Natura*;[122] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Natura*.[123]

Αἱ Θεολόγος. a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *Alter Locus*;[124] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Alto Luogo*;[125] c. 1325 (Muntaner): *Altolloch*;[126] first third of the 14th c. (*Istoria del*

[103] K. Kretschmer, *Die italienischen Portolane des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1909), p. 641.

[104] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.* G. L. F. Tafel, *Constantinus Porphyrogenitus* (Tühingen, 1847), p. 38. Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig* (=*Fontes Rer. Austr.*, XII–XIV), Vienna, 1856–57, I, 474.

[105] G. L. F. Tafel, *Constantinus Porphyrogenitus*, p. 38.

[106] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*

[107] *Ibid.*

[108] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 178, 186. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1889), I, 425. W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant* (London, 1908), p. 151. R. M. Dawkins, "The Place-names of Later Greece," p. 24.

[109] K. Hopf, "Geschichtlicher Ueberblick über die Schicksale von Karystos auf Euboea," *SAWien*, XI (1853), p. 571 n. 1.

[110] Ed. Lanz (Stuttgart, 1844), p. 421, 431 *et passim*.

[111] A. Rubió y Lluch, *Documents per l'historia de la cultura catalana mig-eval* (Barcelona, 1908–21), I, 97 n. 1.

[112] W. Miller, "Notes on Athens under the Franks," *English Historical Review*, XXII (1907), 521.

[113] Rubió y Lluch, *op. cit.*, I, 286.

[114] J. A. Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches Historiques sur la Principauté Française de Morée* (Paris, 1843), I, 130 n. 1.

[115] W. Miller, *loc. cit.*, 519.

[116] Ed. A. Morel-Fatio (Geneva, 1885), pp. 121, 155.

[117] Ed. M. Natalis de Wailly (Paris, 1882), § 420.

[118] This variant in Buchon, *Nouvelles recherches*, I, XXX n. 5.

[119] *Archivio Storico Italiano*, VIII (1845), 338; cf. *ibidem*, n. 79.

[120] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, 640.

[121] C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi* (Münster, 1898–1901), I, 371.

[122] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*

[123] *Ibid.*

[124] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 193.

[125] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, 654.

[126] Ed. Lanz, p. 371 f.

Regno di Romania): *Alto loco*;[127] a. 1375 (Catal. map): *Alto Luogo*;[128] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Alto Luogo*.[129]

Βαθύ. (a) Laconian harbour Northeast of cape Tainaron. 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Vatia*;[130] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Natia*.[131] (b) Laconian cape North of cape Hierax. 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Bota*;[132] a. 1311–1320 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Bote*;[133] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Labotta*.[134]

Βουθρωτός. 11th c. (*Chanson de Roland*, v. 3220): *Butentrot*;[135] a. 1111 (by the South Italian poet Guilelmus Apulus): *Botrontina urbs*;[136] a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *Butrinto*, *Butrento*;[137] a. 1294 (Neapol. doc.): *Butrontoy*;[138] between 1311–66 (Papal documents): *Botrotenensis*, *Votrontinensis* [adjective];[139] end of the 14th c. (*Libro de los Fechos*): *Otrento*.[140]

Ζάκυνθος. a. 1207[141] (Papal letters): *comes Jacinti*, *insula Jacinti*;[142] a. 1212 (Papal doc.): *Jacint*;[143] 13th c. (*La Cronique des Veniciens* de Maistre Martin da Canal): *Gichintos*;[144] a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *super Zanto*;[145] 13th c. (Ital. portolano): *Çante*;[146] end of the 13th c. ("Insulae Aegeopelagi"): *Zante*;[147] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Ziante*;[148] a. 1301 (French doc.): *Jacinte*;[149] a. 1304 (French doc.): *Jachint*;[150] a. 1311–20 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Iazante*;[151] begin. of

[127] Ch. Hopf, *Chroniques Gréco-Romanes* (Berlin, 1873), p. 145.

[129] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*

[129] *Ibid.* — Further material: W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce dans le Levant* (Leipzig, 1885–86), I, 540 n. 8, 541 n. 4. W. Brockhoff, *Studien zur Geschichte der Stadt Ephesus*, Diss. Jena, 1905, p. 50 n. 3. Dawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[130] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 635.

[131] *Ibid.*

[132] *Ibid.*, p. 636.

[133] *Ibid.*

[134] *Ibid.*

[135] Ed. T. A. Jenkins, 1924. The interpretation of the passage of the *Chanson de Roland* by Henri Grégoire, *Byzantion*, XIV (1939), 269 ff.; *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, Acad. Royale de Belgique, 5e sér., XXV (1939), nos. 10–12, 211 ff.

[136] Muratori, *RISS* V, 271 f.

[137] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 226, 273.

[138] J. A. Buchon, *Recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1845), I, n. 1 to p. 321.

[139] Eubel, *op. cit.*, I, 147.

[140] Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

[141] The earliest record in which *θ* is rendered by *t*, seems to be *Jagent* in the medieval Latin text of English origin, *The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II. and Richard I.*, of the end of the 12th c., ed. W. Stubbs, II (London, 1867), 199.

[142] Buchon, *Recherches*, II, 477 f.

[142] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, n. 2 to p. XXXIX.

[144] *Archivio Storico Italiano*, VIII (1845), 340.

[145] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 242; cf. *ibidem* I, 264; I, 469. Dawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[146] "Portolanfragment der Bibl. Marciana," Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 656.

[147] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 176.

[148] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*

[149] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, 387 n. 1.

[150] Buchon, *Recherches*, II, 482.

[151] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*

the 14th c. (Marino Sanudo): *Iante*;[152] first third of the 14th c. (*Istoria del Regno di Romania*): *Zante*;[153] middle of the 14th c. (Giovanni Villani): *Giacinto*;[154] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Zante*;[155] a. 1375 (Catal. map): *Iazante*;[156] end of the 14th c. (*Libro de los Fechos*): *Jacento*.[157]

Θάσος. a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *Taxo*;[158] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Taxo*;[159] a. 1311–20 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Taxo*;[160] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Taxo*.[161]

Θερμήσιον. a. 1356 (Will of Walter of Brienne): *Trémis*.[162]

Θῆβαι. 13th c.[163] (Henri de Valenciennes): *Estives*;[164] a. 1292 (French doc.): *Estives*;[165] a. 1305 (French doc.): *Estives*;[166] a. 1308 (French doc.): *Estives*;[167] c. 1325 (Muntaner): *Estiues*;[168] a. 1328–30 (Catal. doc.): *Estives*;[169] middle of the 14th c. (*Le livre de la conqueste*): *Estives*;[170] end of the 14th c. (*Libro de los Fechos*): *Stivas, Estivas*.[171]

Κάρπαθος. End of the 13th c. ("Insulae Aegeopelagi"): *Scarpanto*;[172] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Scarpanto*;[173] a. 1311–20 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Scarpanto*;[174] a. 1375 (Catal. map): *Scarpanto*;[175] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Scarpanto*;[176] between 1317–1408 (Papal documents): *Sc(h)arpatensis* [adjective].[177]

Κόρινθος. 13th c. (Henri de Valenciennes): *Chorynte*;[178] 13th c. (Morean coins):

[152] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hannover, 1611), II, 287.
[153] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 116.
[154] *Lib.* IX, c. 281, ed. A. Racheli (Trieste, 1857–1858), I, 282.
[155] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*
[156] *Ibid.*
[157] Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
[158] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 165. Cf. Dawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
[159] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 659.
[160] *Ibid.*
[161] *Ibid.*
[162] W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant*, pp. 264, 265 n. 1.
[163] The earliest record seems to be a. 1102 *Stivas* in the writings of the English merchant Saewulf, cf. W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant*, p. 159 n. 2.
[164] Ed. M. Natalis de Wailly, §§ 593, 600.
[165] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, n. 4 to p. 290.
[166] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, 388 n. 1.
[167] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, 393 n. 1.
[168] Ed. Lanz, cap. 240 *et passim*.
[169] Rubió y Lluch, *op. cit.*, I, 97.
[170] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, Index.
[171] Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, pp. 44, 103 *et passim*.
[172] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 176.
[173] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 662.
[174] *Ibid.*
[175] *Ibid.*
[176] *Ibid.*
[177] Eubel, *op. cit.*, I, 462. — Dawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 39. Dawkins, *Annual of the British School at Athens*, IX (1902–03), 179. B. Migliorini, *Studi Bizantini*, II (1927), 309.
[178] Ed. M. Natalis de Wailly, § 688 n. 2.

Corintum;[179] a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *in culfo Corranti*;[180] a. 1311–20 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Coranto*;[181] first third of the 14th c. (*Istoria del Regno di Romania*): *Coranto*;[182] middle of the 14th c. (*Le livre de la conqueste*): *Corinte*;[183] a. 1364 (Italian lists of the fiefs of Morea): *Coranto*;[184] a. 1375 (Catal. map): *Coranto*;[185] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Corenta*;[186] a. 1394 (Ital. doc.): *Coranto, Choranto*;[187] a. 1394 (Ital. doc.): *Corinto*;[188] 14th c. (Italian version of the *Chronicle of Morea*): *Coranto*;[189] end of the 14th c. (*Libro de los Fechos*): *Corento*.[190]

Κύθηρα. End of the 13th c. ("Insulae Aegeopelagi"): *Cerigo*;[191] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Zerigo*;[192] a. 1311–1320 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Cetri*;[193] first third of the 14th c. (*Istoria del Regno di Romania*): *Cerigo*;[194] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Cerigo*;[195] a. 1398 (Venet. doc.): *Cedericum*.[196]

Λεβίθα. a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *Livita*;[197] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Leuita*;[198] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Leuita*.[199]

Λιθάδα. a. 1262 (Venet. doc.): *Ponta Litadi*;[200] a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *ponta Litaldi, ponta Delitalde*.[201]

Μαραθώνα. 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Maratona*;[202] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Maratona*.[203]

Μοθώνη. a. 1211 (Venet. doc.): *Modone*;[204] begin. of the 13th c. (Geoffroi de

[179] Buchon, *Nouvelles recherches*, I, p. LXX f.
[180] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 170.
[181] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 634.
[182] Hopf, *Chroniques*, pp. 100, 105.
[183] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, Index.
[184] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 229.
[185] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*
[186] *Ibid.*
[187] Buchon, *Recherches*, II, 428.
[188] Buchon, *Recherches*, II, 435.
[189] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 423 *et passim*.
[190] Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, p. 15 *et passim*. — Dawkins, "Place-names," p. 25. Migliorini, *loc. cit.*
[191] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 176.
[192] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 656.
[193] *Ibid.*
[194] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 127.
[195] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*
[196] H. Noiret, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la domination Vénitienne en Crète de 1380 à 1485*, Paris, 1892 (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 61), p. 93 f. — The modern occidental name of the island, *Cerigo*, developed according to Venet. phonetics from an older form **Cetericum*.
[197] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 229.
[198] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 660.
[199] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*
[200] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 53.
[201] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 167, 220.
[202] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 637.
[203] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*
[204] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, II, 133. — The form with *d* presupposes a type with *t*; it seems that the form with *d* radiated from Venice.

Ville-Hardouin): *Modon*;[205] a. 1226 (Venet. doc.): *Modone*;[206] 13th c. (*La Cronique des Veniciens* de Maistre Martin da Canal): *Modon, Moudon*;[207] a. 1277 (Venet. doc.): *Mutone*;[208] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Modon*;[209] a. 1311–20 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Mudun*;[210] first third of the 14th c. (*Istoria del Regno di Romania*): *Modon*;[211] middle of the 14th c. (*Le livre de la conqueste*): *Modon*;[212] a. 1375 (Catal. map): *Modom*;[213] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Modon*;[214] a. 1391 (French list of the fiefs of Morea): *Modon*;[215] a. 1394 (Ital. doc.): *Modone*;[216] a. 1395 (French itinerary): *Modin, Modon*;[217] 14th c. (Italian version of the *Chronicle of Morea*): *Modon*;[218] end of the 14th c. (*Libro de los Fechos*): *Modon*.[219]

Μυζηθρᾶς. a. 1278 (Ven. doc.): *Musistra*;[220] first third of the 14th c. (*Istoria del Regno di Romania*): *Mistra*;[221] middle of the 14th c. (*Le livre de la conqueste*): *Misitra*;[222] 14th c. (Italian version of the *Chronicle of Morea*): *Mistrà*;[223] end of the 14th c. (*Libro de los Fechos*): *Misitra, Mizitra*.[224] The Gr. form **Μιστρᾶς** is derived from the Frankish type.

Παρθένιος. 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Partelli*;[225] a. 1311–1320 (maps of the Genoese Petrus Vesconte): *Parteni*;[226] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Spartelj*.[227]

Ρέθυμνον. 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Reteno*;[228] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Rettemo*.[229]

Σκλαθος. a. 1278 (Venet. doc.): *Scati*,[230] *Loscato*;[231] 13th c. (atlas Luxoro): *Scati*;[232] 14th c. (Venet. chronicle of Andrea Dandolo): *Schiatum*;[233] last quarter of the 14th c. (atlas Pinelli): *Scatti*.[234]

[205] Ed. J. A. Buchon, Paris, 1828, p. 41.
[206] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, II, 261.
[207] *Archivio Storico Italiano*, VIII (1845), 537, 548.
[208] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 138.
[209] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 635.
[210] *Ibid.*
[211] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 106.
[212] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, Index.
[213] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*
[214] *Ibid.*
[215] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 230.
[216] Buchon, *Recherches*, II, 428.
[217] *Le Saint Voyage de Jherusalem du Seigneur d'Anglure*, ed. Bonnardot-Longnon, Paris, 1878, §§ 28, 29, 329, 341.
[218] Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 425 *et passim*.
[219] Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, p. 28 *et passim*.
[220] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 231. Cf. Dawkins, "Place-names," p. 42.
[221] Hopf, *Chroniques*, pp. 108, 116.
[222] Buchon, *Recherches*, I, Index.
[223] Hopf, *Chroniques*, pp. 447, 453.
[224] Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, p. 49 *et passim*.
[225] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 650.
[226] *Ibid.*
[227] *Ibid.* Cf. W. Tomaschek, "Zur historischen Topographie von Kleinasien im Mittelalter," *SAWien*, CXXIV (1891) 9, p. 77.
[228] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 663.
[229] *Ibid.*
[230] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 161.
[231] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, 191.
[232] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 659.
[233] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, II, 3. Cf. *Schiati* in Buondelmonte, quoted by Bursian, *Geographie von Griechenland* (Leipzig, 1862–68), II, 385 n. 2.
[234] Kretschmer, *loc. cit.*

Τάθυρα.[235] c. 1325 (Muntaner): *la ciutat de la Tira, la Tira.*[236]

Middle Gr. **τρικάνθιν* passes into Old Genoese: the existence of Old Genoese **trigant* is proved indirectly by Neapolitan *drigantum*, recorded in a Middle Lat. text of the 13th c. and obviously a loan-word from Old Genoese; the same Genoese word appears also in Venet. *triganto* (14th/15th c., in the manuscript of the *Fabbrica di Galere;*[237] and in the 16th c. in a passage of the Venet. admiral Cristoforo Canale), in Ital. *drigante*, and in Span. *trigante* (1627).[238] The secondary Old Genoese type *tragant* is first attested for the year 1246; it radiates to France, where the *hapax tragant* is found in a translation of the Genoese Middle Lat. text of 1246; Genoese *tragant* is the basis of Span. *tragante* (1611); and of Ital. *dragante* (beginning of the 17th c.): in this form the naut. term survives in modern Italian, and in the modern dialects of Genoa and Venice. From Ital. *dragante* derive modern Fr. *dragan* (recorded since the beginning of the 17th c.), Modern Provençal *dragan*, Span. *dragante*, and Catal. *dragant.*[239]

Besides *triganto*, *dragante*, *crose*, originally "cross," is used in the Venet. dialect for the designation of the wing transom.[240] The earliest records I have found are in the *Venetae republicae statuta navium*, a. 1255.[241] To this Venet. denomination corresponds Modern Gr. σταυρός, originally "cross," [242] both showing the same figurative meaning. But as early records are lacking for the Gr. nautical term, it is not possible to state whether the two terms have developed independently from each other or whether the one presents a loan translation of the other, either *crose* of σταυρός, or σταυρός of *crose*.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

[235] Other variants are: τὰ Θύραια, Θύρεα, cf. E. Honigmann, *Byzantion*, XIV (1939), 653.

[236] Ed. Lanz, pp. 369 f., 372. Cf. Tomaschek, *op. cit.*, 34.

[237] Jal, *Archéologie navale*, Paris, 1840, II, 6.

[238] Jal, *op. cit.*, I, 287.

[239] Vidos, *loc. cit.*

[240] *Dizionario di marina*, pp. 210, 1296.

[241] Tafel-Thomas, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 418, 428, 429, 440. Another explanation of this passage in Jal, *op. cit.*, I, 268 and 259 n.

[242] Palaskas, *op. cit.*, *s.v.* hourdi.

THE ART OF STORY-TELLING IN THE DODECANESE

By R. M. Dawkins

Some few years ago Dr. W. H. D. Rouse put into my hands an extensive manuscript collection of Greek folklore material of all sorts for study and eventual publication. It is upon this that the present paper is based. Dr. Rouse was travelling in the Dodecanese in the early years of this century. The islands were then in the hands of the Turks, and though the pressure of the government was beginning to make itself more felt than in the palmier days of the special privileges of the Dodecanese, it was not enough to do more than slightly hamper the freedom and the economic prosperity of the inhabitants. It was possible for foreign visitors to circulate freely. The twilight of Young Turkey and the black night of the Italian occupation had not yet darkened the sun of those fair lands. Dr. Rouse had the fruitful idea of collecting the folklore of the islands on the same lines as those so happily followed by a number of local scholars, those men to whom Greece owes so much.[1] But the task was not easy for a foreigner, especially for one whose time was limited, and Dr. Rouse set Mr. Jacob Zarraftis of Kos to work for him.

Zarraftis was a native of Kos, and when I was in the islands in 1906 was a man between middle and late life. He had some property in Kos and from this and, I think, a little dealing in antiquities he picked up a living. Occasionally he was able to publish a little pamphlet on the local antiquities: he gave me copies of Θαλύσια τῆς Κῶ 1906, printed in Samos; of Κώϊα, 1921; Κώϊα, 1922; and Κωΐων, Β′ μέρος, 1923; all three printed in Kos. As they must now be very hard to acquire, I ought perhaps to add that they do not seem to me of very great value. The work he did for Dr. Rouse, on the other hand, was excellent, and he collected a great deal that but for him would have by now certainly been lost. He was curator of the Kos museum, and I think one might regard him as a typical scholar of his place and time.

[1] Most of their work has been published in volumes of the Constantinople Σύλλογος (VIII, XIX, XXI, XXXI), and in the same Society's Ζωγράφειος Ἀγών. To which I would add the Καρπαθιακά of Emmanuel Manolakakis, Athens, 1896.

The greater part of this material Zarraftis collected from the town and villages of Kos, but he had relations with other islands and wrote down much, especially folktales, in Leros and in Astypalaia; a little comes too from Kalymnos. From other informants the Rouse collection contains a few items from Patmos and Euboia, but these are of comparatively little importance; no other collector was found of anything like the skill and industry of Zarraftis. The ballads, verses, riddles, glossaries and so on, do not concern this paper; nor does the rich information on folk customs. I concentrate on the art of story-telling as it is revealed in these rather more than forty stories. Of a very few more than one version was collected, one generally very much better than the other, but for the most part all are separate and independent pieces.

To one of the first questions that naturally arise Zarraftis has unfortunately given us no answer at all. We have no information as to the age, sex, or social position of the narrators, and we are left equally in the dark about their audiences.

This silence is once broken. In a footnote we are told that a story from the village of Asphendiou in Kos was got from a woman, Hatzi-Yavrouda, Yavrouda the Pilgrim. It is headed *Myrmidonia and Pharaonia*, but the subject, the wrath of a nymph, an Anerada (Ἀνεράδα), at the cutting down of her grove would make *The Nymph's Revenge* a more suitable title. Here I must mention another Asphendiou story, *The Wicked Stepmother:* the earlier part is traditional, and is in fact practically, though by no means verbally, the same as a story from Astypalaia. But all the latter part, which deals with the folklore belief in the nymphs who beguile men to the dance and how a man may be freed from them, seems quite original, and has the same merits as *The Nymph's Revenge.* The feminine touch seems betrayed by the full details of the birth and nurturing of a savage little monster, who later turns from being a snake to a very charming young prince. Even more cogent is the carefully description of the morning toilet of a very tiny baby. A third which has much the same qualities is a long story called *Yannaki* (Jack or Johnnie), which is in fact a version of the Apollonios of Tyre romance. It seems to me likely that all these three stories are by this same woman. Her special strength is in descriptive passages, a few of which will be quoted below.

In a story from Pyli in Kos a man's voice seems to be heard. It is a sort of Wit and Wisdom story, in which the difficult question is discussed how a man should deal with the younger generation, when he comes to share his property with them. Several men had, by a too foolish generosity, got thrown out of their houses by the young people, and the prudent man instructs them how, by clinging to their property, they may keep the whip hand over the juniors. It is very like a man to make out that all such domestic troubles are due to the conduct of the sons' young wives.

If we turn to the stories themselves, we are at once struck by the fact that the traditional fairytale plays a very minor part. Of the whole collection I find only about one-third, about fifteen stories, which can properly be brought under this heading. Of these almost all come from Astypalaia, which indeed yielded hardly anything else.[2] Since this kind of story forms the very great majority of almost all Greek collections, it is not necessary to say much of it here. We find ourselves in the familiar fairy world.[3] Characteristic themes are struggles with ogres, for so would translate δράκος, and the adventures of the hero in search of the mysterious lady known here as the Very Fair (ἡ Παράμορφη), or the Five Times Fair (ἡ Πεντάμορφη); in collections where the Turkish element is more marked she is generally called the Fair One of the World (ἡ ὡραία τοῦ κόσμου), or even by her Turkish name of *Dounia Guzeli*. We often meet the husband or wife from fairyland, where in the manner of Cupid and Psyche the otherworld partner is lost and at the end of the story recovered. A notably pretty story of this kind is from Astypalaia, *Donna Clera*. She is a daughter of the rainbow, who is a witch, and is married to a youth who, though adopted by human parents, is in truth a son of the Sun and of his wife the Moon. A childless man in a dream saw the Sun and the Moon, and they promised to give him their son; he awoke to find by his side a child like a little angel smiling at him. Donna Clera carries off the youth by the aid of her magic horse, but he as usual loses her. In the end his parents, the Sun and the Moon, his mother-in-law the Rainbow, and the Mother of the Winds with her twelve sons, help

[2] The same is true of the Astypalaia stories in Pio's *Contes populaires grecs* and in K. Dieterich's *Sprache und Volksüberlieferungen der südlichen Sporaden*, Vienna, 1908.

[3] See Μιχαηλίδης-Νουάρος, Λαογραφικὰ Σύμμεικτα Καρπάθου, I, 267, and Adamantiou's Τηνιακά, in Δελτίον τῆς ἱστ. καὶ ἐθνολ. ἑταιρ. τ. Ἑλλάδος, V, 277.

him to recover her. The whole story has a poetic and imaginative style very much above what is usual in such narratives; a kind of airy lightness, fitting a land of bright sunshine and windy seas.

Other features of these fairy stories are equally well known. We hear of kings and queens, princes and princesses, viziers and their lady wives, the king's Council of Twelve, the cunning Jew or the mysterious dervish or monk, the kindness of the hero to the animals who reward and help him, in short all the familiar, partly oriental elements of the Greek folktale. Wedding festivities last always for forty days and forty nights, the villain is put to death by being torn to pieces by four horses, the Fair Lady is apt to dwell in a region so far off and so strange that no bird can reach it in its flight, and so on. The Council of Twelve and the viziers point to the east; so too, I think, does the building which seen from afar looks like an egg: this clearly belongs to a land of domes. These elements are hardly to be found in any of our tales except those of this fairyland sort.

The stories in our collection from Kos and Leros are for the most part of quite a different kind. They contain not infrequently elements and episodes found also in the fairy stories, but the main thread of the narrative taken as a whole has quite a different character. We seem to have fresh and original creations showing strong marks of individual handling. They are in fact novels of what passes for contemporary life, and their originality is shown by this that the parallels which are so common for the fairy stories are with the very hard to find. The narrator has treated his material freely, working in elements from all sources, but in essence telling his own story and not merely passing on what he has heard from others.

These stories invite a profitable comparison with a collection of tales all very much of the opposite type, traditional fairy tales of the sort we can recognise in Astypalaia. These are the stories which in 1909 to 1911 I was able to collect from among the Greek-speaking Christians of Asia Minor. They were printed in my *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, to which Professor W. R. Halliday contributed a chapter on the subject-matter. He found that, with very few exceptions, they could be classified under certain fairly fixed types, hardly straying from the wholly impossible and quite

extravagant world of fairyland. There were examples of such well-known story patterns as *Puss in Boots. The Man born to be King, Snow White, The Three Oranges*, and so on. There were a few didactic stories, but these were equally traditional, and even for some tales of intrigue told me by a blind man, and the only "grown-up" stories I got, parallels were easily to be found. But the bulk of the stories were of fairyland, and the tellers were children, who had learned them from their mothers, or very often from one another. The style was invariably bald; dialogue was reduced to a minimum; characterization hardly existed; the personages were all very good or very bad. As the stories had been learned by heart, defective memory had sometimes led to incoherency, and there was a complete absence of any faculty of invention by which gaps might be filled. No tale showed any signs of individual composition. In short, the art was in full decline and had become merely an amusement for children. It was children who listened to the stories, and I was told at Pharasa, a very remote village in the Taurus, where collecting was particularly easy, that each child knew one or two stories, and that these were his or her contribution when children gathered together to amuse themselves in this way. The comparative excellence of two stories I gathered at Delmeso, a Greek village near Nigde, was simply due to the better memory and greater intelligence of the boy who told them.

The fixity of these stories is remarkable. Of a tale I recorded in 1911 I possess another version in manuscript collected some twenty years earlier by Anastasios Levidis of Zindzi-Dere, and the closeness of the two is really extraordinary.

No very deep study of the Zarraftis stories is needed to convince oneself that the conditions in the Dodecanese must have been very far indeed removed from what I found in Asia Minor. The narrators were clearly grown-up people working for an adult audience; for people of not much formal education, yet of great natural intelligence and of some subtlety of mind. Fortunately we have two excellent descriptions of such narrators and such audiences, and though the authors have as yet printed only a very small part of their collections, there cannot be much doubt that what they tell us is very much what we should have learned from Zarraftis, if it had occurred to him to set it down. That the

people were rather less sophisticated than the Koans seems likely because of the preponderance of the traditional fairytales, but on this point we must await a fuller publication of the material.

These two writers are Dr. Adamantios Adamantiou, who collected tales in Tenos and published in 1900, and Dr. M. G. Michailidis-Nouaros of Karpathos, who worked some thirty years later.[4] In his earlier years, says Michailidis-Nouaros, and this will be about the beginning of the present century, there were as yet no cafés in the villages of Karpathos, and people used to gather together in the winter in some convenient house and in the summer sitting on the flat roofs of the houses. I was in Karpathos first in 1903, and at that time the red-tiled roofs, which in 1917 were so hideously conspicuous in such richer villages as Aperi, were still nowhere to be seen; every house had its flat earth roof (*δῶμα*). At these gatherings people played cards and of course talked politics, but also amused themselves by listening to anecdotes, riddles, and stories.

The narrators were usually, we are told, men (*παραμυθάδες*): in such semi-public gatherings women would be shy of speaking; they confined themselves to telling much shorter stories to their children at home. Recognized story-tellers would be specially invited, and would sometimes tell tales so long that a single story might last for several evenings. But when Michailidis-Nouaros published his book in 1932 things had altered; men were no longer telling stories at all; all that was left were a few old women telling fairytales to children. But even so the author collected over fifty pieces.

In 1900 Dr. Adamantios Adamantiou published his account of storytelling in Tenos, where he was then stationed as scholarch. Both men and women had skill in telling stories, and notable practitioners were called, the men *παραμυθάδες* and the women *παραμυθοῦδες*. The times chosen were the nights of winter, and especially the forty days of the fast before Christmas: of a good narrator it would be said that "he knew all the stories of the Forty Days" (*αὐτὸς ξέρ' τοῦ σαραντάμερου τὰ παραμύθια*). They were held in some consideration; one of them boasted to Adamantiou: "So and so for all his learning used to send people, and with a

[4] See Σ. Π. Κυριακίδης, Ἑλληνικὴ Λαογραφία, μέρος Α' (1922), p. 284.

lantern, to fetch me to tell him stories." Sessions were held in the long evenings (σπεροκαθίσματα), often at the village baker's, where the heat of the great oven made the house comfortable. Sailors and fishermen, too, were great tellers of stories as they waited for the wind either on the shore or in the coffee-house, drinking their sage tea, hot and aromatic. The workshops of the shoemakers were another center. I remember myself being in a house at Komiaki in Naxos when stories were being told; this was in the December, 1912.

The Greek islanders of forty years ago were in a social condition perhaps not very often found. They were a people of great intelligence and quickness; mentally progressive and bodily active, but at home living in somewhat remote villages and abroad in sailing ships, and very little touched by the contemporary outside world. There were as yet no gramophones, no wireless, and no cinemas to destroy their own native culture and ways of thought; under Turkish rule even newspapers were none too common. Most of the people, certainly all the men, could read, but their books were mainly of the school and of the church. By nature they were extremely sociable, and these village gatherings with talk and story-telling were an essential part of their life, but they had long been too sophisticated in their own natural way to be fully satisfied with the old-fashioned fairytale so entirely separated from the interesting life which they themselves were living. Some sort of development in the art of narrative was inevitable. In his book on Greek Folklore Kyriakidis expressly notices the tendency of folktales, when the fairy world becomes less credible and less interesting, to push forward and become novels of real life. In fact it would seem that, as people grow out of what is a very primitive stage, the folktale may take two paths: either the art continues more or less unaltered and falls into the hands of children, as was very notably the case with the Asia Minor stories, or it continues to interest older people by changing into the novel dealing with life as known or as imagined by the auditors. No doubt both things may happen in the same community: our own bookshops have shelves for children, and I can hardly doubt that if Zarraftis had searched for them, he would have found among the children of Kos and Leros any number of stories of the old fairyland.

In most of the collections of Greek folktales which I have read the traditional fairy element is very much to the fore. We have a fair mass of material from many of the islands: in the Dodecanese, from Symi and from Nisyros; in the Cyclades, from Tenos, from Syra, and from Mykonos: nearly all of these are fairy stories. Such of the as yet unpublished stories collected in Chios by Mr. Stylianos Vios (Βίος) seem to be of the same kind. The mainland is much less well represented, but the stories from Epeiros published by the Syllogos are fairy stories; so too are the Athenian stories of Marianna Kambouroglou. On the other hand some stories from Crete and from Kastellorizo are for the most part novels.[5]

The development of the newer type of story is of course gradual, and it is therefore common to find embedded in the tales of common life episodes and phrases derived from the older fairytales. Again, the world of the Greek islander, certainly of fifty years ago, is a good way from the one we know, and the stories often deal with such creatures as the nymphs (*ἀνεράδες*) and ogres (*δράκοι*) of popular fancy and belief. Sometimes whole tales are constructed on their dealings with men of this world. This aspect of the subject I developed in a paper recently read before the Folklore Society of London,[6] and in particular gave an analysis of the long tale which I have described above as *The Nymph's Revenge*. Many of the novels also are arranged to point a moral; here efforts are made to increase the attractiveness of the narrative, quite apart from its ethical value, by adding to the psychological interest.

A good example of this embellishment of an old theme is afforded by a version from the town of Kos of the widely spread story of the man who goes traveling with a mysterious elder, whose actions teach him the inscrutability of the dealings of the providence of God. The story as usually told is that a man is accepted as a traveling companion on condition that he asks no questions about the elder's actions. Three times a seeming injustice is committed; the unkind man is rewarded by a kind

[5] For Symi, Nisyros, Kastellorizo and Crete I refer to the above mentioned Σύλλογος volumes; for Tenos and Syra to Pio; for Mykonos to Louis Roussel's *Contes de Mycono* (Lwów, 1929); for Athens to *Παραμύθια, Μαριάννας Γρ. Καμπούρογλου* (Athens, 1912). Mr. Vios' Mss. are in the possession of the Athens Lexicon.

[6] To be published in their journal *Folklore*.

action; the hospitable man is requited with what seems cruel ingratitude.[7]

The story is Rabbinic, told of the prophet Elias. It appears in the Koran, where the elder is the Servant of God, the mysterious Khidr. With the simplicity of these and other versions we may compare this Koan narrative. The man is a schoolmaster; the guide is an unnamed "holy elder." The story is enlarged to have four and not three instances of a questionable recompense for their treatment as guests, and two other incidents are introduced to show still more clearly the blindness of the man of this world as against the inspired insight of the strange companion. As the two are on their way, they pass a fine and handsome rider; the elder presses his nostrils as though there were carrion about, although to a dead beast lying by the side of the road he pays no attention at all. On their return journey they find the dead body of the gallant knight, whose death the elder had been inspired to foresee. The second incident is that they see a man cutting down a terebinth tree; the axe slipped and killed, not the man, but his innocent ass. The explanation vouchsafed at the end of the story is that, if the man had been killed, as indeed he deserved to be for cutting down so useful a tree, the traveller might have been accused of murdering him, and having no witness of his innocence might have found himself in danger of his life. The man was not let off: he was punished by the loss of his ass. Their journey carries the companions through the villages of Kos, and the hospitality incidents are worthy of note as showing a subtlety and inventiveness quite beyond the range of the story as usually told. At the village of Pyli they were received, and quite honorably, in the house of a very rich man: fittingly, but not with the affectionate cordiality of the poor man who had been their host at Asphendiou. In the night the elder rose up and by his magic art built a fine tower in their rich host's garden. This seemed to his companion an over-lavish return for his not very zealous hospitality; but this was not the full truth. The elder explained that the man had been intending to build the tower himself; had he

[7] The story has been discussed by F. W. Hasluck in *Christianity and Islam*, Ch. LV: *The Three Unjust Deeds*. The then unpublished Imera version to which he refers, in which the mysterious person reveals himself as Christ, I have now published in *Medium Aevum*, VI, p. 181. A general reference may be made to Friedländer's *Die Chadirlegende*.

been left to do so, he would in digging the foundations have found a buried treasure, but this would have ultimately caused his death, because another man would have murdered him in order to get it. The result of the elder's act was therefore to save his life — incidentally, too, the cost of building — but not to deprive him of the enjoyment of the treasure; the man therefore neither lost nor gained; just as his hospitality had been in relation to his wealth only mediocre, though creditable as far as it went. He had shown himself neither good nor bad, and as such had been treated. The very conception of a mixed character of this sort shows a great advance upon the sheer black and white of the stock form of the story. The moral is of course as always, that divine dealings must not be judged by what man can see of them.

At Antimakhia, where they were refused any hospitality at all, the people were given money, over which they quarrelled. At Kephalos a rich man received them very well; like the poor man at Pyli, he was requited with seeming ingratitude, but the result was to bring him a very substantial benefit.

Very close to this story is the teaching, implicit in several of the moral tales, that man should acquiesce in whatever fate, luck, or, to use religious language, the will and mercy of God may bring him. Once, in a story from Astypalaia, this is held up as an almost heroic ideal. Two men were friends and made a written agreement that their children should marry one another. One became rich and the other poor; the former had a son, and the latter a very beautiful daughter. The poor man sent his wife — against her will, but it was her duty — to ask the rich woman for her son, but she was rudely repulsed. The daughter of the poor man fell in with a porter (the carrying of burdens is always regarded by the sharpwitted Greeks as a typically humble occupation), but her parents were in despair and arranged that they should marry. The porter treated his bride with great consideration and generosity, and while this was going on, the rich young man saw her and fell in love. He sent his mother to make a proposal of marriage, but the girl's mother rejected this. Her daughter was already married, and in any case the porter was the man sent her by fortune; to him she must cleave. The story is called *What Comes by Luck*, *τὸ τυχερόν*, and the virtuous poor resign themselves to the decree of fortune. The final discomfiture

of the rich family is brought about by the porter's revealing himself as the king in disguise.

The idea of luck or fate, the wordly opposite number to the will of God, is very present. In the above mentioned paper in *Folklore* on the background of popular belief worked into these stories, I have analyzed a tale of a man who went to seek for his Fate. He found her in her cottage and saw how at random she dealt out riches and poverty to the souls of the newly born. In another story from Leros about the daughter of a schoolmistress in the island who was fated to marry a prince from the fairy world below ours, we are told: "Every man in this world has a fixed fortune, a guiding genius, a luck, an angel; I hardly know what to call it, good or bad" (*Ἔχει καὶ πῶνα ριντζικό, στοιχιό, τυχερό, ἄγγελο, δὲν ἐξέρω πῶς νὰ σᾶς τὸ πῶ, καλὸ γιὴ κακό*).[8]

There are a number of other moral stories, generally bearing marks of individual handling. "God will Provide" is the theme of one of them; another is to teach that anything however seemingly impossible may come to pass, "if God wills." The morality is always of a practical caste. Charity, moderation, and patience are commended; of otherworldliness or asceticism there are no traces. How the stock treatment is often improved we may see from the familiar story of the Two Women, one bad and the other good, and the Twelve Months. One woman was poor but good, and spoke to the Months, represented as twelve youths, kindly and gratefully. Her rich but churlish sister answered them harshly and morosely. Each was given in return for her speech coals from the fire at which the Months had been warming themselves. For the good woman these turned into jewels, but for the rich woman they became deadly serpents. So far as the story is common enough, but in the Zarraftis version, from the town of Kos, the general duty of cheerfulness is reinforced by working in another well known theme, the two hunchbacks, one good and one bad, and making them the husbands of the two women. As usual the good hunchback is relieved of his hump and the bad one has the other's hump added to his own; so at the end he goes off with two humps, to find his wife killed by the serpents.[9]

[8] *Ριζικόν* I translate "fixed fortune" because it is derived not, as was thought, from Ital. *risico*, but from *ῥίζα*, for which see Xanthoudides, in *Λεξ. Ἀρχεῖον*, I, 174.

[9] For a parallel from Pontos see *Λαογραφία*, VII, 185.

Of the pure novel the best example is the version of Apollonios of Tyre, which I have already mentioned; it is based ultimately on the rhymed version first published at Venice in 1534, but as I have dealt with it at length elsewhere I do no more here than mention it. It is the longest and in many ways the best story in the whole collection. A much less ambitious effort in the same genre is a story called *The Boatman*, from the town of Kos: it introduces the folk belief in the nymphs of the sea and the Water of Life, reminiscences of the Alexander Romance not uncommon in modern Greek lore. This is not the place to develop this point, and I go on to give the thread of the story.[10] The hero is a boatman. A ship's captain came to the port where he worked and fell in love with his wife. The usual wicked old woman induced the wife to dress as a boy, and the captain took her away with him to Smyrna. The boatman followed them; first to Smyrna, then to Constantinople, and then to some Black Sea port. His money ran out, and he went to work in a cookshop. The captain came there to eat, and the boatman induced him to take him to his ship as his servant. On board the boatman was recognized by his wife who, to get rid of him, falsely accused him of theft. His eyes were put out and he was thrown into the sea. But by good fortune he bumped up against a plank and so was carried to the shore. Lying on the beach, he heard music: this was the nymphs, the Anerades (*ἀνεράδες*), singing and dancing on the sands. They guided him to the Water of Life; with this he anointed his eyes and regained his sight. He carried away with him some of the water, with which he cured blind people, finally restoring the sight of the daughter of the king of Constantinople. For this he was made admiral; the wife and the ship's captain were hanged, and the boatman married the king's daughter.[11]

Another story of the same sort is called *The Daughter of the Rich Man* (Ἡ Μειαλανοπούλα); it was collected at Asphendiou in Kos, and might be another of Hatzi-Yavrouda's stories. It runs thus. A king's son and the daughter of a rich man went to school together and she helped him with his lessons and went on doing so even after she had left the school: the clever girl often appears in these stories. Her father said that she was then too old to

[10] To be published in the *Modern Language Review*.

[11] See "Alexander and the Water of Life," *Medium Aevum*, VI, 173.

receive the prince without scandal, but this did not stop them, and one day they were found together. The girl hid him in a chest, where he was stifled, and then she got rid of the body by giving it to a servant to take it away and bury it. But the man blackmailed her, and at last forced her to visit him and his boon companions at midnight. The girl got them drunk and killed them all. Years afterwards she felt moved to take the Communion and had to make her confession. The wicked priest demanded a sum of money for his absolution, and then betrayed her confession to the king in order to get the reward he was offering for anyone who would tell him the fate of his son. The girl was sent for, and she revealed the whole story. The king pardoned her, and the priest was hung up by the tongue as a warning against betraying confessions.

Here we see a good moral worked in at the end of a novel of life; several of these stories are in fact written round a moralizing idea. A good example is from the town of Kos. It is called *Helen*, and the idea is that it is precisely the greatest rascals who make the most ostentatious display of piety. A good deal of island life is sketched in as the background of the story. The thread is as follows:

A king had an only son; a negress serving in the palace fell in love with the boy, and to force him to her will locked him up in a cellar, spreading the report that he had been carried away by robbers. The vizier's daughter also was in love with him, and she set out to find him. On her way she delivered a king from his vampire wife, a probably inserted episode as it has no connexion with the thread of the story. On her way back again, intending to take service in the palace, she met four men, led off to be tried on a charge of robbing a shop; among them was a friend of hers whom she knew to be a good man. He alone had been found on the scene of the crime; the three others had been arrested on his denunciation. His story was that his unfaithful wife had locked him out of the house, and he had taken refuge in the shop in order to get some sleep, but he had not seen the thieves at all. But how then did he know their names? He said he was sure that they were the men, because he had observed their great show of piety in church; they made such demonstrations of devotion that he had no doubt they were scoundrels. The vizier's daughter thought that she too might find out something, and hearing this story she "began to think it over. It was Saturday afternoon, so the next day was Sunday. And she says to herself: 'How many times have I heard my nurse now in heaven (*μακαριασμένη*) say: Whoever wants to hear news of all sorts should go to the river where the girls are washing clothes; just like water their mouths run over with the news that first one and then another has to tell. Or go to the fountain where the young girls are waiting in a row to fill their jars, and you will hear a string of stories of what happens in everyone's house. Or go to vespers where the servant girls who know everything are singing a quiet psalm all among themselves about

their mistresses right through to the end of the service.' " So she went off to hear vespers and in the morning Mass. She saw a negress showing all the marks of extreme piety, and then overheard a long dialogue between her and the serving women of her own mother, the wife of the vizier; the two women were gossiping about her own disappearance and that of the prince. The vizier's servant said of the prince: "Well, he is a lad and what harm can they do to him? But alas, for my poor young mistress." — "But why do you say Alas?" said the negress: "the girl wanted it and now she has had it." — "And that's true enough, my dear; unless a girl has an understanding, does she ever get carried away?" — "Now we must be off; vespers are over." And so they all left the church, the vizier's daughter having picked up a good deal from their innuendoes. She then went into the service of the king, and observed that after every meal the negress carried off fragments of food. She followed up this clue and found the imprisoned prince, and the story ends with the execution of the negress and the happy marriage of the prince and the vizier's daughter, the festivities lasting as generally in these stories for forty days and forty nights.

These realistic little pictures of common life are found in several of our stories, more especially in the novels, and they serve to bring even the traditional themes into connexion with the common life of the day. A story of a girl who finds her way down into the underworld below ours, which appears in so many Greek fairytales, and there wins a prince for her husband, begins with one of these sketches. The story is from Leros. Most Greek country women go out in the spring cutting herbs for food, what are generally called *ραδίκια*, but the heroine here, being the daughter of a schoolmistress, is ignorant of all such homely matters. Her mother, however, begged the other girls to take her with them, but she did not know one plant from another, and the other girls grew tired of her questions and finally left her to herself, promising that in the evening they would give her a share of their gatherings. Left by herself like this, she lit upon the hidden steps which led her down to the lower world. Here a typical fairy story follows this little sketch of real everyday life.

In two stories we have a description of a storm at sea, naturally interesting to a nation of sailors. The more elaborate is in the Koan version of Apollonios of Tyre, here called *Yannaki*, in many ways the best, as it is the longest of all these stories. I have already suggested that the narrator was a woman. A storm at sea might seem a subject more natural to a man, but it may be noted that technical details, which a man accustomed to the sea would certainly put in, are here entirely absent. The repetition of the same word — "thunder thundering," "flashes of lightning flashing,"

and so on — are rather a rhetorical device than any result of poorness of vocabulary. The passage runs thus:

So they raised the anchor, set the sails and laid them to the wind. The ship was well ready for the sea, and Angelica was sitting by the side of her Jack very well pleased; she felt that his breath and his life were her own breath and her own life. Next day the weather broke. They were in the open sea; the sky was clear of clouds. But no long time passed before clouds formed themselves on every side, and shortly the sky was all clouded over; the ocean sighed, oppressed by all those many black clouds. The wind began to whistle in the cordage of the ship; the night was growing darker; flashes of lightning were flashing from the far distance, and from the depth of heaven the thunder was thundering. Hail began, and the demons of the storm were showing their flickering lights on the masts. As the night went on, so the weather became worse; the lightning flashed constantly from more quarters of the sky and more frequently; the thunder thundered with still louder thunderings and more terrifically; the rain fell heavy and dense, the wind whistled like a demon in the cordage of the ship and the sea howled terribly. Then at midnight the storm increased in violence. The wind, how furious and savage! And that rain which seemed to be falling in buckets! That lightning, how terrihle, every moment cleaving the foundations of the firmament! The waves were like mountains, rising up and sinking down, rolling forward with irresistible violence. The ship would not obey the rudder, and the savage waves smote her pitifully; at times she was hurled up into the air, at times she was let fall into the foam of the waves. Night gave way to day, and the storm flung all its fury upon them. Midday passed; another night came. The terrors and alarms hurled upon them by the savage storm were greater than ever.

"Jack was full of grief for his Angelica," and so the story goes on with the birth of Angelica's child, her apparent death, her burial at sea, and the final deliverance of the ship.

A similar but much shorter description comes from Antimakhia in Kos. It serves as the opening of a longish story about the adventures partly in the real world and partly in an enchanted underworld of a youth with the same standard name of Yannaki, Johnnie:

A ship's captain was once sailing on his way on an evening of bad weather; it was windy and so dark that a man might fear and tremble to be at sea. The ship was creaking on one side and cracking on the other, and the bows groaned among the foamy waves: she moved over the sea in her violent course like a great cloud. It was so dark that a man could not see his hand or even where he was going. At that moment there appeared a flame flaring up on the land, and by its brightness the men saw that they were very close to being utterly wrecked on the steep rocks, and that no one would save even the tip of his nose (*καὶ νὰ μὴ γλυτώσῃ γὰ μηὲ ῥουθοῦνι*).

The Apollonios tale contains an interesting description of a dance. The hero is dancing before the court and the people, and charming everyone by his skill: his lady is watching him from a window. The appreciation of sensuous beauty carries us miles

away from the dry manner of the old fairytale. The men are clearly dancing some variety of the common Greek ring dance: the dancers link hands and form an open ring, which moves slowly round and round. The leader performs elaborate steps and figures; the rest follow with a plain step moving forwards and then swaying a little backwards, going on thus until the leader tires. From the description we have of the leaps and twistings of the leader, the dance is likely to be the lively πηδηχτός, the leaping dance, rather than the more sedate συρτός.

The dance began; the young men were dancing and singing songs, and Jack was still eating and drinking, enduring all his troubles. But little by little he drank plenty of wine and came to a cheerful mood. Then he forgot his woes; he remembered that he was in his strength and young, and he poured out still more wine and drank his fill. Then he rises up and approaches the dance, free of care and full of pride, and asks leave to take the place of leader. All men's eyes were upon him and upon his old woollen clothes, and they were smiling in a mocking manner. But as soon as they had given him the permission, Jack took his place as leader and started to get into step with the dance. All men's eyes were upon him with derision, looking to see some drunken young shepherd and to laugh at him. Suddenly they see that he was settling quickly to his dance like a real master. Then all the mocking faces changed, and became full of eager interest. Presently they are watching him make those skilful turns and twistings in such a way that the very best dancer could not excel him. Then still more were the eyes of all gazing upon him and could never have enough, men marvelling at the art, at the dexterity and at the beauty of his dancing. So too the princess was very much pleased with him, as she looked at him from above, delighting in his dancing. Without paying heed to anything at all but the music, Jack went on dancing still better and in a yet more masterly style, so that he made everyone marvel at him.

There follows a description of the hero at dinner and his good appetite, a thing much to delight this a simple audience. Then came another dance:

When Jack had eaten and drunk very well and come to a cheerful mind, he again forgot everything and rose up from the table and went to the dance. All were waiting for him from one moment to another, and the princess as well. When they saw him coming, at once the man who was leading the dance left his place and ran off and took the young shepherd by the hand and put him to lead. The instruments of music tuned up to accompany him, and the players watched his steps with great attention. Jack began, and little by little settled himself to his dance until he became a little warm, and then he began again to display his marvellous art with the beautiful turns of his fine dancing and the graceful swayings of his slender waist. And so beautifully and gracefully was he dancing that nobody regarded his old woollen clothes, but only the charm of his dancing. All men's eyes were fastened upon him and could never have enough of gazing at him.

The fairy tales occasionally contain similar pictures drawn from the local life. From Astypalaia comes a story called *The*

Lily (ὁ Σκρῖνος), the theme of which is the marriage with a Fairy Husband. Here is how the hero shows himself to the people: "Next day, the day of St. George, outside the town a rider is seen on a white, a pure white horse; he had a golden saddle and all his gear was of silver and gold, and he himself was dressed all in gold with a lance in his hand; he was coming toward them looking like St. George, all brightly shining in the brightness of the sun. Some days later he appeared again on a bay horse with a lance in his hand as though he were about to kill some monster; the people thought the rider was St. Dimitrios." Here the narrator is clearly inspired by the great icons of the two warrior saints so often to be seen in Greek churches on the iconostasis.

The Asphendiou story of the Wicked Stepmother, to which I have already alluded, has in its latter and more original part what is perhaps a reflexion of another icon. The fairy husband Neros is seen coming out of the tomb in which he has been confined by the lustful nymphs, the ἀνεράδες. Ἄνοιξεν ἕνα σκέπασμα τάφου κ' ἔβγαινεν ἀπὸ μέσα ἕνας νέος. We may here, I think, see the influence of the icons of the Resurrection. The risen figure stands above the open sarcophagus, the lid of which is lying to one side. The name *Neros* we can see from the Cupid and Psyche character of the story is to be explained as a form of Ἔρως, with the common prefixed *ν*.

Adamantiou notices as a part of the craft of the skilled narrator that he can shorten or lengthen his story by cutting out incidents or by making additions from his general repertory. The word for combining incidents in this way is κολλῶ, *to glue together*, and it cannot but remind us of the primitive meaning of the ancient word *Rhapsode*, the bard skilled in sewing together incidents and episodes. Stories, it seems, were sometimes told in competition, and this power of working in fresh incidents would be a great resource: a man could always be springing surprises on his rival by adding to the length of an otherwise more or less familiar tale.

A story from Antimakhia in Kos gives us a very clear example of such an added episode. The hero is a boy, again called Yannaki, Johnnie; he wandered through magic lands reached by passing through a mountain which had opened to him in a miraculous manner. Yielding to temptation, he disobeyed his master's instructions, and the mountain refused to allow him a passage

back to the world of men. Then he found himself in a country by the sea; fresh incidents with a talisman follow, and after some shape-changing adventures Johnnie reached home and was happily reunited to his father and mother. Of this tale there is a version from Astypalaia in Pio's *Contes populaires*, collected as long ago as sometime before 1869. The story is in details more logical and often better told than in our Koan version, but it is a good deal shorter, and in particular lacks a long episode, which is plainly marked as an addition by a later teller in having no connexion at all with the general plot. When the hero was by the sea, he was one day amusing himself by flying a kite. Then a brigantine appeared, and from her a boat came to the shore with the owner; he was a lord, a *lordos* (λόρντος), the common Greek word for a traveller from the west, always supposed to be of fabulous wealth. The *lordos* took the boy on board his ship (ἕνα περγαντὶ λόρντικον) and made him his adopted son. But Johnnie proved so very extravagant and spent so much money, that the *lordos* grew tired of him and took him back to the place where he had found him. There without any warning he stripped him of his fine clothes and left him on the shore bewailing himself. At this point the *lordos* disappears and the story resumes its main thread. To go away with a wealthy traveller is often the romantic but businesslike dream of the young Greek; in folktales it is commonly a dervish or a cunning Jewish merchant who proposes in this way to make the boy's fortune. The mixture of harshness and indulgence in this particular patron seems rather on an oriental pattern.

For another contact with contemporary life I must hark back to *The Wicked Stepmother*. The heroine is sent away with a negro servant to be blinded and have her hands cut off. She found herself in the mountains, and here she met the prince who was shortly to marry her. Another shorter version of this story is given us from Astypalaia, and in this the prince's reason for being in the wilds is as much of today as hers is of the fairy past: he has been sent there by a very modern doctor to recover his health as in a sanatorium, because he was "ready to say goodbye from consumption" (πού͂τομ πρῶτα ἀποντζούρι 'πὸ τὸ χτιτσό),[12] from which of course he duly recovers through the prayers of a pious hermit. The much fuller Koan version is not so prosaic; I have

[12] 'Απουτζούρι is a hard word. I can only conjecture that it is the French *bonjour*.

mentioned above the trouble of the hero, who has yielded himself to the Anerades, the nymphs or fairies, and was being forced every night to exhaust himself by joining in their dances.

The traditional fairytales are, as one would expect, very much more conventional both in style and matter than the novels; they represent an older stage in the art, and this appears from another particular, the set formulae used at the beginning and ending of a story. These fixed phrases are in many parts of the world quite a feature in the art of the narrator, although, as Professor Halliday has remarked, Greek folktales have not much to show in this way, and in these Dodecanesian stories even less is to be found than usual.[13] The stories commonly begin in the simplest way, introducing the characters: "Once and a time there was," "At that time there was," and so on. Very occasionally we find a general wish for the good health of the company. Dodecanesian and Cypriot stories often begin with a little verse which suggests that the story was being told in a company where the women were working wool, winding the yarn on the big revolving reel. Here is the verse from an Astypalaia fairy story called *The Little Horse of Gold* (Τὸ Χρυσοαλοάτσι):

Red thread twisted well,
Neatly wound upon the reel;
Push the reel to make it spin,
Then my story can begin.

Κότσινη κλωστὴ κλωσμένη
στὴν ἀνέμη τυλιμένη.
Δός της τσοῦννον νὰ γυρίσῃ,
παραμύτθι ν' ἀρκινήσῃ.

The verse is often followed by "A good beginning for the tale: a good evening to you. Once upon a time there was," and so on. But only five of our stories have this beginning; one from Kos, one from Leros, and three from Astypalaia, and all five are traditional fairytales. I find only one commencement formula which is new to me and this is in the Astypalaia story called *What Comes by Luck* (*τὸ τυχερόν*), by exception a story of real life. It runs:

"Οτσα βροῦλτα 'στὴβ βρουλτσά
τότσες τρύπες 'στὴν τσοιλτσά,
τσ' ὅτσα βρουλοκόμματα,
'στῶμ μάερων τὰ στόματα.

[13] In my *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, p. 220.

The general sense seems to be that there are as many mouths in a kitchen waiting to be fed as there are rushes in a marsh. The word τσοιλτσά is of course dialect for κοιλία.

The tales in the same way generally end quite abruptly; the last sentence sometimes clinches the narrative or points the moral. A pretty example is from an Astypalaia fairytale, *The Sugar Boy* (ὁ Ντζακχαρένος): "and the other princess lived happily with her Sugar Boy until they grew old in loving fashion, and all the world made a story of their love and of their life" (τσ' ἡ νὰ ἄλτη βασιλοπούλτα σαίρετο τὸν Ντζακχαρένον της ὥσπου γεράσανε μαντζὴ γαπημένα, τσ' ὁ κόσμος οὖλτος εἶσε δήημα τὴν ἀγάπην τος τσαὶ τὴν ντζωήν τος).

There are however a few fixed formulae; like the conventional beginnings, they belong to the fairytales and hardly ever occur in the novels of real life. A few examples may be noted. An Astypalaia story has the common ending: "They ate and drank and gave gifts to all the world." This occurs too in a fairytale from Leros and in another from Astypalaia. In the one story Zarraftis recorded in Kalymnos, a story of the nymph in a baytree, the formula is given a satiric turn: "And they ate and drank and to us never gave anything." Another Astypalaia fairytale ends thus: "And from henceforth their life was all honey and milk and they ate and drank and gave to all the world.

What now are stories told to you,
In older days were true as true.

In the Greek: Τσαὶ πὸ τότες πλτσὸ ἐπερνοῦσαν μέλι τσαὶ γάλα, τσαὶ τρώασι τσαὶ πίνασι τσ' οὖλτουνοῦ τοῦ κόσμου δίνασι.

Τσαὶ τὰ παραμύτθσα
Ἤσαμ πρῶτ' ἀλήτθσα.

The sceptical note appears in the endings of three fairytales from Astypalaia. Two run: "All was sweet as honey, but I was not there to see," and "I was not there nor anyone who is listening to me." The third runs: "In the love of the people was their strength and the pride of their lives." Then the verse:

My tale is at an end;
Belief I leave to you.
But even pleasant stories
Have in their day been true.

Τὸ παραμύτθι μας τελεύτσει,
Τσ' ὅλος θέλει ἂς πιστεύτσῃ
Μὰ τσαὶ τὰ παραμύτθσα
Γενῆκαν ἀπ' ἀλήθτσα.

The Koan story on the difficult question of how a man should deal with his property in his old age ends thus: "I have told you my tale, and now some other bird must sing."

These formulae, hardly appearing in the novels, belong to the older tradition, and seem to have been going out of use with the fairytales to which they properly belong. The greater frequency of the formulae in the Astypalaia stories goes with the vogue for fairytales in that island. Their disuse in Kos marks the more individual, less conventional stage of the art.

If folktales are the germ of the novel, and in these Koan stories we seem to be able to trace the development, there is another kind of folk narrative which may be regarded as a primitive kind of history: the tradition, the story relating to some past event, generally localized and deriving its value from its truth, the kind of thing which, as Makhairas says, "will please those who delight in histories of old times" (*οἱ ποῖγοι θέλουν ἀλεγριάζεσθαι τὰς παλαιὰς ἱστορίες*).

Of such traditions Zarraftis gathered hardly anything; the islanders possibly do not preserve many such stories and Zarraftis' neglect may be due to a similar indifference. Of Karpathos Michailidis-Nouaros tells us that he could find very few, and that in the Dodecanese they are everywhere rare; he thinks this is because they have no close link with the social life of the people, who can easily dispense with them.[14] He may well be right: on such a point no one certainly is a better judge. But Zarraftis did collect a few stories about a notable pirate of Astypalaia who flourished early in the nineteenth century. His name was George Negros, but he seems sometimes to have been called Jouvelekas. Of him we have three stories. In one we learn that when he was at school he had trouble with the master, who harshly wanted to cut off his hand in punishment for an insulting gesture. The father and a Cretan friend then killed the schoolmaster and they all became outlaws. The second is a story of the hidden treasure left by the pirate. The third tells how he came to kill a French naval

[14] See Μιχαηλίδης-Νουάρος, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

captain called Brisson, and how the Frenchman's son came to Astypalaia to give reverent burial to his father's bones, but was artfully deceived, so that what he actually buried were the bones of the pirate who had brought about his death. The tomb is now a conspicuous object in the island and I much regret that I did not visit it to see the inscription.

The harvest is scanty, but these stories are excellent; the notion of how the pious son was beguiled by the seemingly simple shepherd who wanted the reward of forty napoleons is very amusing and very much in the spirit of the place.

I hope in another place, perhaps when I succeed in publishing these texts, to make some study of the language in which they are recorded. For the present it must be enough to say that they are told in the dialect of each island or village as it sounded to Zarraftis, and as he was able to transcribe the sounds with the use of the Greek alphabet. Occasional inconsistencies are to be found: when these are in phonetics and inflexions it may be supposed that Zarraftis' text is not exactly as he heard the story; when an occasional purist phrase occurs it is at least as likely as not that it comes from the actual narrator. These are, however, very scarce. It is plain too that the neatly written sheets which Zarraftis sent to Dr. Rouse are not what he wrote when he actually heard the story; slips, and some of these minor inconsistencies, may easily have crept in as he recopied.

One point may be mentioned. In his Astypalaia texts he almost invariably writes $\tau\theta$, by which he probably means an aspirated τ where common Greek would have θ. My experience in the Dodecanese has led me to believe that this aspirate occurs only for the $\nu\theta$ of common Greek, or where in many of the islands θ is for some reason doubled. The syllable $\theta\iota\alpha$ also is sounded with a certain stopped element. From my notes I see that this aspirated stop for $\nu\theta$ and $\theta\theta$ is heard in Telos, Nisyros, Kalymnos, and Symi; from a friend I learn that it is sounded also in Khalki and in parts of Rhodes. Elsewhere in the Dodecanese the sound is $\theta\theta$, the spirant prolonged. Pernot's evidence from Chios points the same way.[15] I would hesitate to question the ear of a Greek, and the aspirated stop may have spread a good deal by the action of analogy, but I feel tempted to think that it is at least possible

[15] H. Pernot, *Phonétique des parlers de Chio*, pp. 409–415.

that, when Zarraftis came to copy out his texts, he thought that the aspirated sound should be written for all cases of θ. The sound seems not to occur at all in his own island of Kos, and in writing down the dialect of Astypalaia where he was, after all, a stranger, Zarraftis was recording a dialect very different from that of his native land. That τθ is used, though inconsistently, for all cases of θ in the texts printed by Dieterich is no further confirmation of its reality, for these texts were in fact all contributed by Zarraftis himself: this he told me when I met him in Kos, and he was bitterly complaining that he could not get paid for them.

The same argument applies to the numerous cases of τθ in Dieterich's Kalymnos texts also sent to him by Zarraftis.

But after all allowances have been made, these texts give us the longest, and but for the very carefully written Karpathian texts recorded by Michailidis-Nouaros, the best samples we have of the Dodecanese dialects. The vocabulary is singularly free from Turkish, there are a few words from the Italian. The most striking feature is the number of words clearly Greek, but not to be found in the dictionaries, and only with difficulty in the various local vocabularies which have been printed. At the meaning of some of them I can only guess; when the treasures of the Athens dictionary are again available most of these puzzles, it is safe to say, will be solved.

Everything in these stories points to the purity of the Greek population of these islands. Behind even the traditional fairytales and still more the novels, one can always discern the same character. The people are lively and witty; sometimes rather cynical. Keenly sensitive to sense impressions and to beauty, they are sensuous, but the texts are never in the least lascivious. They are enthusiastic and ardent, but always with a thread of commonsense business ability for which they have clearly a great admiration. The rich man is very important, and his wealth gives him the title ἄρκοντας, *lord:* the common word for rich, πλούσιος, hardly, I think, occurs. I quote here two descriptions of the hero of in these stories: of one it is said that he "was a young butcher, handsome, hardworking, prudent, and honorable; with his many graces he made a lot of money in his butcher's shop." The other was "a young ploughman, a very handsome youth, hardworking and the richest man in the town." To inquisitiveness they frankly

admit, but it is demanded that a man be charitable to the poor, kindly, and above all hospitable. In adversity patience and submission to the will of God are commended; of the unpractical "Byronic" idea of revolt against fate and heaven these people have no notion whatever; one feels that they would all say "what is the use of breaking yourself against that which is stronger than all of us?" The social structure is that of Greek peasant and island life. This is the world as it appeared to these storytellers of some forty years ago: one wishes it was their world today.

OXFORD, ENGLAND.

BLOOD VENGEANCE (*MAINA*) IN SOUTHERN GREECE AND AMONG THE SLAVS

By André Mirambel

The purpose of this article [1] is not so much to compare the exercise of the right of vengeance and its manifestations among the Slav peoples and the Maniots; it is rather to elucidate the *characters of vendetta* among the populations of Maina by utilizing the Slavonic data, which are better known. The origin and evolution of the institution may thus become clearer, especially if more account is taken than hitherto of the vocabulary relating to vengeance in connection with the underlying historical facts. It is often dangerous to judge customs by merely comparing the corresponding gestures; every interpretation is then possible, and it is easy to find the resemblances and differences required to support a given thesis. But by doing this, no light is shed on the origins of an institution or even on the actual relations between similar practices in different regions. This is how Miklosich [2] and Vlavianos,[3] interesting though their observations are, came to disagree in explaining the existence of vengeance in Maina: the first sees it as a Slav importation, the second as a natural development which took place under definite conditions.

It seems possible to attempt a study starting from the terms which, among the Maniots, refer to the traditions of Vendetta.[4] The complex character of these traditions will thus come to light

[1] The article was intended for the *Revue Internationale des Etudes Balkaniques* which is so competently edited by MM. Budimir and Skok in Belgrade. The war has prevented me from sending it to them. May they excuse me and share my hope that one day our friendly collaboration may be resumed. Being retained in Great Britain, I wish to express my gratitude to Byzantion, xvi, for publishing this article. Let it be my very modest tribute of admiration to the great country whose victory is the wish of every man who thinks freely: it is the very condition for the pursuit of research and the existence of scholarship. I thank my friend and colleague Dr. Nicholas Bachtin who undertook the translation. A. M.

[2] *Die Blutrache bei den Slaven* (1888).

[3] *Zur Lehre von der Blutrache (mit besonderer Berücksichtigung dieser Sitte in Mani)*, 1924.

[4] The method is indicated by A. Meillet in *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, 7th ed., p. 1–2. Baruzi draws attention to it in his *Problèmes d'histoire des religions*, p. 37, note.

and it will be easier to discern which elements in the institution belong to Greek civilization and which are derived from an alien source.

I

Throughout the whole of the Maina dialect, "vengeance" is denoted by the word *ὀγδικιωμός* (<**ἐκδικαιωμός*). The word refers not only to the act of vengeance itself, but to all its accompanying circumstances, in particular to the reasons motivating the act: slander, adultery, murder. Another term similar to *γδικιωμός* also occurs, *ἡ γδίκιωση*. As long as an individual does not use his right of vengeance he is *ἀγδίκιωτος*. There is also the expression *παίρνω τὸ δίκιο (μου)* ("to take one's right, to take vengeance"), which is abundantly attested in popular literature,[5] e.g. *νὰ πάρουνε τὸ δίκιο του* ("let them avenge him"), *τὸ δίκιο τοῦ πατέρα τους* ("the right of their father"), *ποιὸς εἶναι ὁ μαυροφονιᾶς νὰ πάρω τὸ δίκιο σου;* ("who is thy foul murderer that I may avenge thee?"), etc. Side by side with these expressions there are others which may refer either to the whole of the traditions of vengeance or only to the avenging act itself: *παίρνω τὸ αἷμα (μου) πίσω* ("take back the blood (which had been shed, stolen), to take vengeance"). Thus we have, for instance, *νὰ πάρει τὸ αἷμα του πίσω* ("let him take vengeance"). In this type of expression terms occur which imply the idea of "payment" and the idea of "debt," e.g., *θὰ μοῦ τὸ πλερώσεις τὸ αἷμα μου* ("you shall pay me the blood which you made me shed"); *μοῦ χρωστᾷ αἷμα* ("he owes me blood, I have to take vengeance on him"); *φονικὸ χρωστῶ* ("I owe a murder"); *ἄλλου χρωστῶ* ("I have to take vengeance on another"); *χρεώστης αἱμάτου* ("owing a vengeance"), *ὀφειλέτης αἱμάτου* ("debtor of blood"); *τὸ χρέος τοῦ αἱμάτου* ("the obligation of vengeance"), etc. This series of expressions fit only when the cause of vengeance is murder. Some of them however (*ἡ ἐκδίκηση, ἐκδικῶ, ὁ ἐκδικητής, ἐκδικητικός, γδικιώνουμαι, παίρνω τὸ αἷμα μου πίσω*) occur also in common Greek, where they frequently denote vengeance in general as well as vengeance due after murder (especially the last of the expressions quoted). But in common usage they lack the pre-

[5] Cf. Vlavianos, *op. cit.*: Pasayanis, *Μανιάτικα Μοιρολόγια καὶ Τραγούδια* (1928), passim; A. Mirambel, *Etude de quelques textes maniotes* (1929), passim, and *Etude descriptive du parler maniote méridional* (1929), Introduction, p. 37.

cision which they have in Maniot, where the vendetta is something more than a mere tradition, an institution involving a complex ritual interplay.

Besides the studies by Miklosich (1888) and Vlavianos (1924) mentioned above, we have several descriptions of the Maniot customs.[6] Without re-examining the causes considered as justification of the right of vengeance there are four characters which must be borne in mind:

(a) The right of vengeance is not necessarily exercised against the person of the guilty man (except in the first of the three cases, that of slander), but against his family as a whole, which is to be struck by being deprived of its most influential and respected member, who is chosen accordingly as the victim. It is thus collective and not individual.

(b) The person entrusted with the carrying out of the vengeance is generally appointed by a council composed of members of the wronged family; the council draws lots for the member of the family — always a man — who has to choose the victim, fix the place and date and perform the deed.

(c) The vengeance, not being an individual act, does not necessarily put an end to hostilities; because of the conditions in which it is exercised it often becomes the starting point of a fresh series of murders extending through several generations.

(d) In order, however, to put an end to the continual slaughter which may endanger the existence of a village by depriving it of men needed to carry on the cultivation of the soil, custom admits three kinds of restrictions: —

(1) the *συνέβγαρμα*, "truce of accompaniment": the appointed victim may not be attacked while in the company of a stranger;[7]

[6] The oldest mentions seem to be those by Yemeniz and by Loucos of Chios, 1800. For later evidence see: Bony de Saint-Vincent, *Relation*, vol. II (1837); Leake, *Travels in Morea*, vol. I (1839); Buchon, *Recherches Historiques sur la Principauté francaise de Morée*, 2 vols., 1845; J. Kohler, *Zur Lehre der Blutrache* (1885); A. Thumb, "Die Maniaten," *Deutsche Rundschau*, XCV (1898), 122; Colonna de Cesari Rocca, *La Vendetta dans l'Histoire* (1908); Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion* (1910), p. 441; Patsouras, Ἡ Μάνη καὶ οἱ Μανιάται; A. Fouillée, *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens* (1914), p. 38; J. Ancel, *Peuples et Nations des Balkans* (1926), pp. 138–140; N. Th. Katsikaros, Ἡ Βεντέττα ἐν Μάνῃ (1931); D. Zakythinos, *Histoire du Despotat de Morée* (1931), I, 22–23.

[7] As a matter of fact, it is here rather a question of avoiding to offend the

(2) the ψυχικό, "truce of forgiveness": after intervention by a third party the injured family often grants forgiveness to the guilty family on condition that they recognize their fault and sue for truce;

(3) the ἀγάπη "truce of reconciliation": without the request of either of the parties concerned, a third person may attempt to obtain an honourable reconciliation by direct intervention; this is what is referred to in folklore by such expressions as (see Pasayannis, *op. cit.*): ἡ μαύρη κατάρα νὰ μὴ σᾶς ἀκολουθᾶ παντοῦ ("May the dark curse not pursue you everywhere"). Or again (ibid., passim):

νὰ ρτοῦνε νὰ τὰ σιάξουμε
καὶ νὰ τὰ συβιβάσουμε

("Let them come so that we may arrange things and become reconciled").

The exercise of the right of vengeance appears thus to appertain to customary family law, which has maintained itself in spite of all official legislation and which is connected with the idea of heredity. It is also bound up, among the Maniots,[8] with certain traditions of the worship of the dead. The aim, in fact, is not only to avenge the family but also, whenever murder is the cause of vengeance, to appease the slain. For if the dead were to remain unavenged — or rather, if the family injured by his murder failed to wipe away the pollution — the dead might turn against his own family. Hence the development of superstitious practices: e.g., a nail is planted in the door of the house where the slain man's family lives and the priest blesses it to prevent the dead from coming back to plague his kinsmen; or, on the other hand, the murderer who has just committed his crime traces a cross on the soil to prevent his victim's soul from pursuing him.

Similar traditions are found among other populations which have preserved the vendetta.[9] They depend on general conditions,

---

stranger by taking vengeance on the person who accompanies him; thus the appointed victim of vengeance enjoys the advantage from the laws of hospitality due to a third person,

[8] Cf. A. Mirambel, *Etude descriptive du parler maniote méridional*, Introduction, end pages.

[9] Cf. works mentioned above, by Miklosich, Fouillée, Kohler, Colonna de Cesari Rocca, Vlavianos; for the Slavonic evidence add also S. Trojanović, *Krvi umir* ("Vendetta and its Appeasement") in *Narodna Enciklopedija srpsko-hrvatsko-*

social and geographical: strong family organisation, in which the individual is completely subject to the whole, and the different families are opposed to one another; mountainous environment in which, owing to difficulties of communication, local traditions and clan-organisation are more easily kept up. It is in geographical conditions of this kind that family law continues to be practised, inasmuch as the corresponding social structure is preserved — among Southern Slavs, Albanians, Corsicans, Sicilians, Neapolitans, Spaniards and Maniots.

In Greece the institution of vendetta appears not only in the region of Maina. It exists and has the same characters in Sphakia (Crete)[10] and Chimara (Epirus).[11] The custom may possibly be very old in the lands of the Mediterranean — Fouillée (*op. cit.*, p. 38) considers it an Ibero-Ligurian characteristic — and identical traditions may have been handed down and developed, under similar conditions, even through changes of populations. As to the existence of the vendetta in Crete and Epirus, it should be noted that there are connections between Maina and Crete on the one hand and between Albania and Epirus on the other. As early as the tenth century, after Nicephorus Phocas had cleared Crete of the Arabs, Maniots came to establish themselves in the western part of the island.[12] In Epirus, of whose customs in the Middle

slovenacka, 1926; I. Jelič, *Krvna osveta i umir u Crnoj Gori i Severnoj Arbaniji* (Vendetta and appeasement in Montenegro and Southern Albania), 1926; A. Mazon, "Les 'Sangs,'" in *Revue des Etudes Slaves* (1933), XIII, 102–6; these studies complete the earlier observations of Dickel, *Montenegro*, and Widemann and Hauff, *Reisen in Montenegro* (1837). For facts relating to the Albanians, see Ch. Picard, "L'ancien droit criminel hellénique et la vendetta albanaise," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (1920), LXXXI, 260 (Bibliography, p. 262 and p. 263, note 3). For the Corsican data see Colonna de Cesari Rocca, *op. cit.*, pp. 26–40. Data concerning other peoples (German, Scandinavian, Celtic, Osset) may be found in Kovalevsky's *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne* (1893).

[10] A. Thumb, "Im Bergland der Sphakioten auf Kreta," *Deutsche Rundschau*, XL, pp. 405–426; Vlavianos, *op. cit.*, p. 54; G. Hatzidakis, Μεσαιωνικὰ καὶ Νέα Ἑλληνικά, I, 351.

[11] Pouqueville, *op. cit.*, I, 80; Leake, *op. cit.*, I, 269.

[12] In works on Modern Greek dialectology account must be taken of the internal movements of populations which took place in Greece, especially during the Middle Ages: relations between Asia Minor and the Tzakonians, between Maniots and Cretans, Naxians, etc. The interpretation of present-day linguistic facts, both of the common language and of the dialects, must rest on a knowledge of those movements. Cf. H. Pernot, "Tsaconien et Grec d'Asie Mineure," *Revue des Etudes Grecques* (1938); Philindas Γλωσσολογικά, 3 vol., 1929. A. Mirambel, *Précis de Grammaire élémentaire du Grec Moderne* (1939), p. IX.

Ages very little is known, the Albanians appeared as early as the beginning of the 11th century (1018). Slav influence penetrated there only later — in the thirteenth through the fifteenth century — and it is also to be noted that among the nomadic Greek populations of Epirus, the Sarakatsanes,[13] the custom of vendetta is unknown. Albanian legislation dealing with the vendetta was fixed only in the fifteenth century [14] by the code of Lek Dukadshin, but the traditions of vengeance are much older, and the Albanians already possessed them when they invaded the Greek lands. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that in Greece no force has ever been able to uproot all local tradition completely: both the Alexandrine and the Roman centralizations were superficial, and with the Byzantine Empire it was a process of decentralization that took place: immediately after the reign of Justinian the Empire began to disintegrate and local life began gradually to reappear.[15]

The existence of blood vengeance in Ancient Greece, where it formed the basis of criminal law in a society based essentially on family solidarity, is a fact which cannot be left out of account [16] in studying the Maniot custom. The persistence of certain traditions of vendetta during the Greek Middle Ages, and a comparison with Slav customs provide another set of evidence. The Maniot vocabulary relating to the institution in question seems at the present time to allow us to distinguish two groups of facts.

II

The expressions which, in Greek in general and in Maniot especially, refer to the traditions of vengeance, revolve round two distinct ideas: the idea of δίκη "justice" (in common Greek today meaning "law-suit") and the idea of αἷμα "blood" (cf. above). The first expresses adherence to a law defined by jurisdiction, the second the observance of a custom of vendetta characterised by an exchange of blood.

The first notion is essentially the one upon which the criminal

[13] Cf. C. Hoeg, *Les Saracatsans*, 2 vols. (1925), vol. I, Introduction.

[14] Cf. Ch. Picard, art. cit., pp. 263–5.

[15] Cf. Ch. Diehl, *Histoire de l'Empire Byzantin* (1934).

[16] Cf. G. Glotz, *La Solidarité de la famille dans le droit criminel en Grèce* (1904), and *Etudes sociales et juridiques sur l'Antiquité Grecque* (1906), *passim*, but especially pp. 5–6.

law of Ancient Greece rests. The second is attested especially among the Slavs. The two conceptions have fused together in Greece, and the Maniot vocabulary bears witness to their coexistence. It is striking, in fact, to observe that the Ancient Greek vengeance-vocabulary centres round the term δίκη while the corresponding Slavonic vocabulary pivots on the term "blood." It is easy to ascertain that the idea of αἷμα is almost foreign to the Ancients, and the idea of δίκη, in relation to vengeance, all but absent from the vocabulary of Slavs and Albanians.

G. Glotz (*op. cit.*) has well pointed out the coexistence in Ancient Greece of a family law, essentially religious in character — the θέμις — and an inter-family law, less mystical, which was named δίκη. This last persisted in spite of the evolution of the city-state which gradually came to predominate over the family; as a matter of fact, private action in cases of homicide did not disappear, and appeal to social justice was never made for avenging a crime perpetrated within the family. In primitive traditions the law of private vengeance "authorizes the offended man to kill the offender in case of adultery, seduction, theft or robbery, but it authorizes also the kinsman of the offended man to avenge him" (*ibid.*, p. 50) because "death does not sever the bonds of family solidarity" (p. 68). The fundamental idea of δίκη, as it was originally conceived, is "that of an example, a model; . . . a judgment is the search for a precedent" (p. 239). The vendetta appears "now as a right exercised by the members of one γένος against those of another, now as a duty which the care for common interest and the legitimate claims of the dead impose on his kinsmen" (p. 92). This conception supposes a close interdependence between the members of the same family and also a connection between vengeance and the worship of the dead. This is indicated by the terms in which the conception is expressed: ἀντικατθανεῖν τοὺς κτανόντας δίκην ("do justice by killing in return those who have killed"), ἴσ' ἀντιδοῦναι ("do justice by paying like for like"). "Punishment" is τιμωρία (τιμωρία ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος, "punishment to avenge the injured"); and ποινή, which means vengeance, is simply reparation by an act in accordance with a debt contracted. The dominating idea here is that of "exchange," which is the foundation of δίκη, as is shown by the terms compounded with ἀντι- (ἀνταποκτείνειν, ἀντιδοῦναι,

ἀντικατθανεῖν). In literary texts, apart from usual and fixed formulas, there are frequent epithets which convey two other ideas — that of "protection" and that of "vengeance." Thus, on the one hand; we have: — ἀοσσητήρ "helper, defender" (Il. XXII, 333), τιμάορος "protector" (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 1280), ἀρωγός "helper" (Sophocles, Oed. R. 147), and on the other: — ποινάτωρ "avenger" (Aesch. *Agam.* 81).

The word αἷμα is rare. Aeschylus in the *Eumenides* (319) has αἵματος πράκτορες ("[avenging deities] who exact ransom for blood") and Euripides (*El.*, 138): αἱμάτων ἐπίκουρος ("defender of blood that has been shed"). The "blood" is sometimes that of the victim, sometimes that of the offender to be punished. The expression αἷμα πράττειν (Eur. *Or.* 1139) is comparatively late and conveys the idea of "debt of blood" rather than that of "exchange of blood." This expression does not seem to possess, like the others, a precise legal character, but rather appears to be literary, as is shown by the use of αἷμα with a different sense in αἵματος πράκτορες and αἱμάτων ἐπίκουρος.

The idea of δίκη reappears in the term ἐκδίκησις frequent in the Greek Middle Ages and denoting "vengeance." It is this word that is used by the Emperor Maurice (sixth century) in describing the Slav vendetta in a passage of the Στρατηγικόν (XI, V, 272) — our oldest witness of this custom among the Slavs (cf. Miklosich, *op. cit.*, p. 39): σέβας ἡγούμενος τὴν τοῦ ξένου ἐκδίκησιν ("considering it a duty to avenge the stranger").

The term, losing its full and precise meaning, has come to indicate "vengeance" in general in present-day Greece, except in Maina where it is attached to an institution.

Slav penetration into Greece took place in three successive invasions:[17] in 549 in Northern Greece, in 588 in the Peloponnese, and in 746 in the Taygetus region. Slav domination lasted for about five centuries (fifth to eleventh). It was not until the eighth century that the Byzantine Empire started the struggle against the invaders; the Empress Irene thrust them back at the battle of Patras in 807, Michael III subdued them in 867, and the Bulgars were defeated in 1018.

[17] Cf. the well known works by Diehl and Vasiliev; for a summary of the relevant facts see vol. V of *L'Histoire Générale* by Halphen and Sagnac (p. 310, *Les Bulgares*); see also Dvornik, *Byzance et les Slaves.*

The tradition of vendetta existed among the Slavs long before they began their movement of conquest. It was, and still is, denoted by the name of "blood" *krva* (cf. Miklosich, *op. cit.*, p. 14). The character of the institution must have struck the Greeks since, first, it is mentioned as a specific feature of alien tribes, second it is described rather clumsily, and finally it is generally referred to under the name *φόνος* "murder." The following are a few relevant passages. They are all later than the one in Maurice, mentioned above, and all use the word *φόνος* instead of *ἐκδίκησις*. An ordinance of the Emperor Andronicus (in 1299), specifying a point (Acta V, 89), says: *ἄνευ τοῦ κεφαλαίου τῆς σιταρκίας, τῆς καστροκτισίας, τῆς ὀρικῆς, τοῦ φόνου* ("with the exception of provisioning of corn, construction of castles, mountain life, vendetta"). The same emperor published in 1319 a decree concerning the criminal law for the city of Yanina, in which we read: *ἵνα ὁ μέλλων ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς φόνον παιδεύηται ὑπὲρ τούτου κατὰ τὴν ἐκεῖσε συνήθειαν* (*Acta et Diplomata Graeca*, V, 82, "in order that he who commits the crime of vengeance be punished in accordance with local custom"). In the regulations of Stefan Dušan (1346) we read: *ἐλεύθερα ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν κατὰ χώραν ἐπερχομένων ἐπηρειῶντε δόσεων, ἤγουν τοῦ φόνου* ("freedom from all local vexations and taxes, namely from the fine of vengeance"), and the term *φόνος* is used again several times in the course of the document.[18]

So the vendetta appeared to the Greeks of the Middle Ages a rather curious custom. Are we, with Miklosich,[19] to conclude from this that vengeance was entirely unknown in Greece at that time? But the persistence, in the Greek vengeance-vocabulary, of terms expressing the idea of *δίκη*, unknown to the Slavs, seems to indicate that in spite of the evolution of the ancient city-state and the Byzantine Empire, the vendetta must have survived in some isolated corners where the conditions mentioned above favoured its survival. The intrusive Slav custom might well have grafted

[18] Cf. Miklosich, *op. cit.*, p. 28. The author comments: "*φόνος* ersetzt das serbische *vrazda*, bedeutet demnach gleichfalls Geldbusse für Todtschlag. Die Bedeutung scheint den Byzantologen so seltsam, dass sie es durch *φόρος* Grundsteuer, ersetzen möchten." See P. J. Alexander, "A chrysobull of the Emperor Andronicus II in favor of the See of Kanina in Albania," *Byzantion*, XV (1942), pp. 167–207.

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 28, "Die Griechen des Mittelalters kennen die Blutrache nicht, und wenn sie noch in diesem Jahrhundert in der Maina herrschte, so ist sie von der nicht Griechischen, slavischen Bevölkerung dorthin gebracht worden."

itself upon those native survivals, adapting itself while also changing them,[20] as is suggested by the appearance of the new idea of "blood" unknown to antiquity. It is highly probable moreover that the Maniots do not represent an autochthonous, purely Hellenic element. In this case too, fusion of populations must have taken place. The very name Μάϊνα appears only in the tenth century in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who remarks also that in the ninth century the Maniots were still pagans and were not baptised till during the reign of Basil I (867–886) (cf. Jireček, *Geschichte der Serben*, I, 33). The Slavs in the seventh century were occupying the region of Monemvasia in the Peloponnese, and two Slavonic tribes, the Μιλιγγοί and the Ἐζερῖται held the slopes of Mount Taygetus. There exists a Serbian tribal name, the *Mà(h)ine* or *Mà(h)ini*, designating inhabitants of the Dalmatian coast (Budua) and Montenegro. The name is not of Slavonic origin but probably Illyrian; it must go back to the name of the Μάνιοι, an Illyrian tribe of the estuary of the Narenta (the name is attested as early as the first half of the 15th century, cf. Dottin, *Anciens Peuples de l'Europe, Illyriens*). Jireček (*op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 55) connects, with some probability, Μάνιοι, Mà(h)ine with Μανιάται or *Maïnotes*, *Maniotes*. Among the Slavonic tribes, partly Serbian and Croatian, who invaded the Peloponnese, there was probably a pagan Slavo-Illyrian tribe, the *Mà(h)ine*, which settled in the region occupied by the descendants of the Ἐλευθερολάκωνες who waged incessant struggle against the Byzantine Empire, against the Venetians, and later against the Turks (see the short historical introduction in my *Etude descriptive du Parler Maniote Meridional*).[21]

The Albanian vengeance-vocabulary also rests essentially on

[20] Lawson (*op. cit.*, p. 26, 440–2) hardly raises this question and is content to say: "The idea of the Vendetta is essentially primitive"; he insists on the religious nature of the institution, which seems open to criticism as far as present-day data are concerned.

[21] Cf. A. Thumb, "Die Maniaten," *Deutsche Rundschau*, p. 122–3: "Ich habe schon bei anderer Gelegenheit gezeigt, dass das griechische Volk zwar im Mittelalter mit fremden Elementen durchsetzt wurde, dass aber die griechische Nationalität Siegerin geblieben ist. . . . Die Landschaft war in den Zeiten des sinkenden Alterthums in blühendem Zustand, bewohnt von Lakoniern, die, als die 'Freien' bezeichnet, unter den Peloponnesiern eine bevorzugte Stellung einnahmen, . . . welche auch von den späteren Bewohnern gegenüber Byzanz, gegenüber den Venetianern und Türken, ja gegenüber der Regierung des neu erstandenen griechischen Staats gewahrt

the idea of "blood," *gjak-u*. The expressions corresponding to Slavonic *krv*, Greek αἷμα (*παίρνω πίσω τὸ αἷμα μου, μοῦ χρωστᾶ αἷμα*) are in Albanian: *kam gjak*, lit. "I have blood" and *jam me gjak*, lit. "I am with blood," i.e. "I have to take back blood, I have to take vengeance." In studying the Albanian vendetta Ch. Picard (*op. cit.*) was led to comparison with the corresponding institution in the private criminal law of Ancient Greece. But his conclusions are these (p. 287): "In summarizing this evidence concerning a present-day society which, on the outskirts of Greek civilisation, presents a curious case of regression and often reminds one of the primitive times of Greece, the Frankish Middle Ages, or Arabia, I do not wish to abuse comparisons, quite instructive in themselves, in the search for cases of historical survival in order to try to establish a historical relationship between the most ancient Greeks and the Albanians of today." Dareste (*Nouvelles Etudes du droit antique*, p. 54), A. Dumont (*Le Balkan et l'Adriatique*, p. 281, note 4) and G. Glotz (*La Solidarité de famille dans le droit criminel en Grece*, p. 599) all come to the same negative conclusion. The filiation of institutions cannot be established with certainty by simple comparison of the traditions in which they are perpetuated. The most one can do is to assert that societies which emerged out of a patriarchal order have preserved certain identical features, throughout all transformations in unequal conditions.

Examination of the facts in the light of corresponding vocabularies seems to afford some degree of precision.

The terms used in Maina in relation to vendetta reveal on the one hand an ancient tradition based on the idea of *defense and protection*, and on the other a more recent tradition based on the idea of *exchange of blood, of taking back the blood that has been stolen*. Only a comparison of vocabularies enables us to fix certain points of chronology; and since the vocabularies used reveal more accurately the meaning and intention of the customs, it also becomes possible to determine the external elements contributed which have transformed the institution.

It may also be seen from the Maniot evidence, as expressed in

---

wurde. . . . Vom Ende des Alterthums bis zum Auftreten des Namens Maina, sind die ethnographischen Vorgänge in der Taenarenhalbinsel in ein geschichtliches Halbdunkel gehüllt. . . ."

its vocabulary, that the religious character, in the strict sense, of the institution has gradually diminished in the course of time. Blood vengeance is a custom which regulates inter-family relations, but (in those places where city legislation has not succeeded in wiping it out) it no longer forms the foundation of the city.

LONDON.

ESSAYS ON BYZANTINE ECONOMIC HISTORY, I
THE *ANNONA CIVICA* AND THE *ANNONA MILITARIS*

By ANGELO SEGRÈ

1. A short introduction on the circumstances and the implications of the famous Edict of Diocletian, *De pretiis rerum venalium*

The Edict of Diocletian *de pretiis rerum venalium* was the last great financial provision made by this Emperor to restore the fortunes of the *orbis Romanus* on the verge of its collapse.

Diocletian issued the Edict [1] in the year 301,[2] very unwillingly,[3] and only after the failure of many financial measures. Until the year 301, the date of the Edict,[4] he hoped that the economic situation of the Empire might be restored by the laws of nature. He abided by the classical Roman political traditions, in many ways so similar to the political doctrines of the eighteenth century. His hopes for an improvement in the economy of the Empire, as is

[1] The Edict has the form of an *Edictum ad provinciales* (See Mommsen, *Ber. d. Kais. Ges. der Wissenschaften*, phil. hist. Klasse, 'Das Edict Diocletians de pretiis rerum venalium', p. 52. The original of the Edict is Latin, as was that of the Edict of P. Oxy. 2106 (304 A.D.), see A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV, 277; such was probably the case with all the Edicts of Diocletian. The preamble is followed by a *brevis*: 'Placet igitur ea pretia quae subditi brevis scriptura designat etc.' The *brevis*, Greek *βρέβιον* (see Seeck, in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v., p. 832) specified the list of the commodities with their prices: in the edict of Aristius Optatus, l. 9, the *μέγα βρέβιον* is the list of the different sorts of land with their *iugatio*.

[2] Mommsen, *ibid.*, p. 50.

[3] The preamble of the Edict shows with probability how reluctantly Diocletian was induced to initiate his sweeping reforms.

[4] The Edict is issued in a period of peace which follows a period of wars. Probably in the mind of the Emperor the wars were in a large part responsible for the economic situation of the Roman world. The most important measures of deflationary character aimed at the restoration of Roman finance were all issued in the second half of the reign of Diocletian. We quote the issue of the *miliarensis* in 295 (A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV, 264) the issue of the *follis* of 25 denarii in 296 (*ibid.*, p. 252), the introduction of *iugatio* and *capitatio* in 297 with the edict of Aristius Optatus: A. E. R. Boak, 'Early Byzantine Papyri from the Cairo Museum,' *Études de papyrologie*, II (1934), p. 1 ff.; Preisigke, Sb. 7622 (297 A.D.); our edict of the year 301; the reduction of the *Antoninianus* to half a *follis* or 12½ denarii shortly after the edict.

known, had failed; inflation raged before and after the Edict.[5] Even the Emperor himself seemed not to rely on his own provisions. He tried too earnestly to justify himself in the eyes of the *honestum publicum* and in the eyes of the prospective transgressors, sellers, and buyers who were threatened with the capital penalty: 'nec quisquam duritiam statuti putet cum in promptu adsit perfugium declinandi periculi modestiae observantia.' The Edict itself, in its preamble, shows that the prices rose from day to day, and that hoarders withdrew commodities from the market, in the expectation of higher prices as a consequence of the inflation. It became still worse after the Edict was issued (Lactantius, *De mort. persec.*, VII, 6 and 7). The Edict fixed maximum prices of all commodities, maximum wages of all trades and professions, maximum costs of transportation of commodities.[6] But its aim was not merely to fix prices for the welfare of the common man. The Emperor needed a basis for the calculation of the public expenses, for taxation and, last but not least, for the *annona militaris*.[7]

The Edict became void very soon (see Lactantius, VII, 6 and 7, and P. Oxy. 2106, where the price of gold is 100,000 denarii a pound instead of 50,000 as in the Edict).[8]

The preamble of the Edict declares frequently that the provisions were to be applied to the whole Roman world: 'maxime cum eiusmodi statuto non civitatibus singulis ac populis adque provinciis sed universo orbi provisum esse videatur.' The same statement is made in PSI 965, issued shortly after the Edict, and dealing with a provision referring to the *follis* and to the *Antoninianus*.[9] The Edict, to be effective, had to be applied to the whole Roman Empire. There was no more place for economic particularism under the tetrarchy after the universal introduction of the new coinage, dating from about 296, after the fiscal reform of 297, and after the suppression of the *politeumata* probably shortly before the latter date.[10]

[5] 'Quod expectandum fuit per iura naturae in gravissimis deprehensa delictis ipsa se emendavit humanitas, longe melius se existimantes non ferendas direptionis notas a communibus iudiciis ipsorum sensu atque arbitrio submoveri quos, cottidie in peiora praecipites et in publicum nefas quadam animorum caecitate vergentes etc.'

[6] I suppose the Edict contained also provisions about the rate of interest on loans.

[7] A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV, 279.

[8] *Loc. cit.*, p. 275.

[9] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 252 ff.

[10] On the *capitatio, iugatio*, suppression of the *politeumata*, see the forthcoming Essay on Byzantine econ. history II.

But although the Edict was to be enforced in the whole *orbis Romanus*, its Greek and its Latin fragments have been found up to now only in the provinces under the direct rule of Diocletian.[11] The Edict, hastily applied to the provinces of Diocletian, very soon became ineffective.[12]

2. The Byzantine *Annona Civica* and Wheat Transportation

A modius of wheat in the time of the Edict of Diocletian cost 100 denarii. The freight of the same quantity of wheat between Alexandria and Constantinople cost 12 denarii or 12 percent of the price of the wheat, according to a new fragment of the Edict found in Aphrodisias in Caria.[13]

[11] Mommsen, *ibid.*, p. 50.

[12] Although Diocletian, until the last years of the tetrarchy, is supposed to have dominated the tetrarchy by his wisdom and his *auctoritas* (See *Cambridge Ancient History*, XII, 329, O. Seeck, *Deutsche Literaturzeit.*, 1894, n. 15), H. Bluemner, in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Edictum Diocletiani, supposes that the Edict was published in the Western provinces, because the *Fasti Hydatiani* of the years 276–319, which do not mention any Eastern events, do mention the edict under 302. He believes that the Edict in the Western provinces was not engraved on stone because it became obsolete so very soon. The new fragments of the Edict found after the edition of Mommsen (1851) show that the tariff of Diocletian included in the *brevis* the commodities of all the provinces of the empire. The traditional opinion introduced by Mommsen that Western products exclusively were mentioned in the edict (Seeck, *ibid.*, and Bluemner, *ibid.*, p. 1951) is not correct, as has been shown by Grégoire in his Seminary of the Oriental Institute.

A fragment of the Edict written in Greek on Carrara marble has been discovered recently in Pettorano (Abruzzi). See M. Guarducci, 'Il primo frammento scoperto in Italia dell' Editto di Diocleziano,' *Rendiconti Pont. Acc. Rom.*, XVI (1940), pp. 1–24; also E. R. Grazer, 'The Significance of Two New Fragments of the Edict of Diocletian,' *Trans. Amer. Philol. Ass.*, 1940, pp. 157 ff. I would not consider the fact that the fragments had been written in Carrara marble as a definite proof that the Edict was actually enforced in Italy.

[13] G. Jacopi, "Gli scavi della missione archeologica italiana ad Afrodisiade nel 1937 XV–XVI," *Monumenti Antichi*, XXXVIII (1939); two published fragments from the Edict of Diocletian on maximum prices of wheat and some other commodities. This important text, which was edited with a very scanty commentary, was made known to me through the courtesy of M. M. Jasny of the Department of Agricultural Statistics of Washington before its publication by E. R. Grazer, "The Significance of Two New Fragments of the Edict of Diocletian," *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LXXI (1940), 157 ff.

In the Edict the maximum price allowed for the freight of wheat from Alexandria to Rome is 16 denarii, to Nicomedia and Byzantium, 12 denarii for each *modius castrensis*, i.e., respectively 16 and 12 percent of the value of the wheat (ll. 24, 25, 26).

The transport of 1000 artabas of wheat from Alexandria to Constantinople amounted to 40,000 denarii, equal to four-fifths of a pound of gold. The evidence of P. Oxy. 2113 (316 A.D.) enables us to make a rough calculation how much gold had been levied from Egypt for the transport of the Egyptian wheat from Alexandria for the supply of Byzantium and of Heracleia in 316 A.D.

P. Oxy. 2113 (316) refers to an order emanating from the *praeses* of Aegyptus Herculia for a levy on land — an aruratio — for the expense of the transportation of wheat from Alexandria to Byzantium and Heracleia. According to this text, for each arura under seed of whatever kind, and for vineyards, there had to be paid 50 Attic drachmas, for each olive tree 2 Attic drachmas, for each arura of pasture land 100 Attic drachmas (ll. 16–17).[13a]

The rate of exchange between the *solidus* and the *denarius* = Attic drachma in the year 316 was 1 *solidus* = ca. 3500 *denarii*.[14]

The surface of the cultivated soil which in Egypt had reached about 10 million aruras in its best period [15] in the fourth to the fifth century A.D. had been considerably reduced. The extent of the soil at pasture was a small fraction of the whole cultivated soil, and olive trees have a very small importance in Egyptian agriculture.[16] The staple products were cereals and particularly wheat. Pasture land and olive groves, on the contrary, were very important in Africa, which in the fourth century A.D. was also an important grain country. The Edict reported in P. Oxy. 2113 (316 A.D.)

[13a] ll. 8 ff. *ἐκέλευσεν εὐθ[ὺς . . .].ς εἰσενεχθῆναι ὑπὸ τ[ῶν? γεωργού]ντων εἰς λό[γο]ν ναύλο[υ τοῦ προχ]ωροῦντος εἰς μετάθ[εσιν . . .]ματικῶν εἴδων τῶν πε[μφθησο]μένων ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρ[είας ἐπ]ὶ τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ Ἡρακλε[ίαν ὑπ]ὲρ ἑκάστης ἀρούρης σπορίμη[ς] .[.]. [οἱ]ασδήποτε οὖ[ν] ποιότητος ἔτι τε καὶ ἀμ{μ}πέλου ἀρούρης μιᾶς Ἀττικὰς πεντήκοντα καὶ ἐλαιουδ[ῶ]ν δρυὸς ἑνὸς Ἀττικὰς δύο καὶ τῆς κορταίας Ἀττικὰς ἑκατόν.* The *ἐμβολή* was assessed at 50 *denarii* the arura on land under seed of any kind: the land tax, on the contrary, took account of the quality of the land. See A. E. R. Boak, "Early Byzantine Papyri from the Cairo Museum," *Études de Papyrologie* II (1933), pp. 1–8. For reduction of *naulon* in case of bad crops, see G. Rouillard, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine*, 2 ed. p. 129.

[14] See A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV (1940), 250.

[15] According to A. Segrè, "Note sull' economia dell' Egitto Ellenistico," *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, n. 29 (1934), p. 299.

[16] For the percentage of wheat and other cereals cultivated, see A. Segrè, *ibid.*, p. 269. In this article I took the view that Egypt with about 7½ million inhabitants would produce a maximum of 90 million artabas of wheat and 30–40 million artabas of barley and *olyra*. I assumed that the consumption of wheat for each person for a year would amount to an average of ca. 11 artabas. Egypt could export no more

probably was the Egyptian version of another edict which referred not only to Egypt but to the other lands which sent the annona to Byzantium and Heracleia.

Probably the cultivated soil of Egypt in the early Byzantine age covered a surface of ca. 6–7 million aruras. 6–7 million aruras assessed with 50 *denarii* upon each arura would make a total of 300–350 million *denarii*, in gold 34–40 thousand *solidi*, a rather low figure, compared with the 80,000 solidi for the freight of 8 million artabas in *Nov. Iust.*, Edict XIII, 8. Starting with 40,000 *solidi* levied from Egypt for the transportation of the wheat to Byzantium and Heracleia from Alexandria and assuming the cost of the freight in gold to be the same in 316 as in 301, i.e., 4/5 of a pound of gold = 57.6 *solidi* for 1000 artabas, we reach the conclusion that Egypt sent less than a million artabas to Byzantium and Heracleia in the year 316. These figures could even be reduced considerably if we assume, as we should, that the price of an artaba of wheat in this period was almost a *solidus*, while in the Edict of Diocletian it was 2 1/12 *solidi*. As long as the distressed economic conditions of the Empire lasted in the early Byzantine period, we may safely assume that the cultivated area of Egyptian soil was reduced, and that the level of taxation in gold was comparatively high, because the purchasing power of gold in wheat was very low.

We are not surprised that the *naulon* paid for the *embole* in gold was only about half the *naulon* of the age of Justinian, when the wheat conveyed to Constantinople was a much larger amount than in the earlier Byzantine period.[17] The calculation of the amount of wheat sent to Byzantium and Heracleia at a million artabas or less is based on the supposition that the transport of wheat from Alexandria to Constantinople cost 12 percent of the price of the wheat, as in the Edict of Diocletian in 301 A.D., a figure very near to the rate of 10 percent found in the more prosperous period of Justinian. But the price of transportation of wheat in 316 is not necessarily the same as in 301 and in the time of Justinian, and as shown in Code Theod. XIII, 5, 7 (334), which grants the *navicularii orientis* the privileges of the Alexandrian

than about 10 million artabas of wheat (*ibid.*, p. 281). In the Ptolemaic period the exportation to the Greek and Syrian towns together was less than the 6 million artabas sent to Rome in the time of Augustus (*ibid.*, p. 291).

[17] See p. 401 ff.

navicularii, l. 10: 'Et ad exemplum Alexandrini stoli quaternas in frumento centesimas consequantur ac praeterea per singula milia singulos solidos, ut his omnibus animati et nihil paene de suis facultatibus expendentes cura sua frequentent maritimos commeatus.'

The *navicularii orientis* transported the wheat under the same conditions to Byzantium as the *navicularii Alexandrini*, as is now confirmed by ll. 26 and 42 of the first new fragment of the edict of Diocletian. These figures, like those of the Edict of Justinian, also show how wrong is the statement 'et nihil paene de suis facultatibus expendentes.'

The *navicularii* received 4 percent of the wheat they shipped to Constantinople and 1 *solidus* for 1000 modii, i.e., about 3 percent of the wheat with an average price of 1 *solidus* for 10 artabas = 33⅓ modii, which is doubtless much too low in price for this period. But the price of wheat in this period was still much nearer to the level of the time of Diocletian, i.e., 2 1/12 artabas = 1 *solidus*, than to the level of the period of Justinian; consequently, the *navicularii* received about 4 percent + ⅔ percent = 4⅔ percent of the wheat. This rate (and even the rate of 7 percent) is far below the rate of transportation prices in the Edict of Diocletian and Justinian. The *nihil paene de suis facultatibus expendentes* must be taken with more than a grain of salt.

These data [18] on the *navicularii* in Cod. Theod. XIII 7, 2 (334) lead us to reconsider the figure of about one million artabas sent to Byzantium and nearby points in the times of Diocletian and Constantine. It is calculated upon a transport price of 10 percent–12 percent. Assuming a transport price of about 5 percent, we must double the figures of the wheat exported, i.e., we must estimate the amount of wheat sent to Byzantium in the early Byzantine period as not very far from two million artabas. Of course it is not possible to decide whether, in the year 316, Egypt sent one or two million artabas of wheat to Byzantium and Heracleia. But even two million artabas of wheat is a low figure compared with the eight million artabas of the time of Justinian.

The Byzantine economy of the end of the third century and a great part of the fourth was dominated by inflation. Besides the

[18] We know that to be a *navicularius* was not a privilege. See G. Rouillard[2], *op. cit.*, p. 121 ff.

debasement of the currency we must take into account in our calculations other difficulties. We cannot say whether the *naulon* of P. Oxy. 2013 (316) corresponded to the entire price of the transport by sea of Egyptian wheat, or how high was the cost of freight in the year 316. We know the amount of the *naulon* only in the sixth century, and in this period the tax of the *naulon* did not cover the entire expense of the freight.

Edict XIII shows that the *apodectes* of the *naula* paid the *navicularii* not only with the *naula* exacted but also with additional taxation. A part of the ἐξαγώγιοἰν was destined for the expenses of the freight,[19] but Justinian lowered the ἐξαγώγιον which could be diverted for the *naulon*.

If we assume that the expenses for the freight were about 10 percent according to the Edict XIII, or about one *solidus* for 100 artabas, we may expect that normally the freight charges exacted were less than one *solidus* for 100 artabas.[20]

We have no way of calculating with the same accuracy the *naula* of the fourth century.

Wallace, *Taxation*, p. 44, assumes that the *naulon* paid for transport by sea of Egyptian wheat was a Byzantine innovation of the fourth century after the grain revenues were diverted from Rome to Constantinople, but P. Oxy. 2016 (316 A.D.) shows that this supposition is not correct.[21]

3. The Meaning of the Figures of the *Annona Civica* in the Byzantine Period

The burden of the *annona civica* was determined by the lack of cereals in the great towns and by the possibilities of supply by the agricultural centres. We may also assume that in the worst period of the Empire Rome and Byzantium needed more wheat

[19] See G. Rouillard[2], *op. cit.*, p. 121 ff. and particularly p. 144. See P. Oxy. 1908 (VI–VII cent.), l. 3, 1000 artabas *naulon* 8 sol. 23 sil., l. 15, 120 artabas 20 sil. P. Oxy. 1912 (VI cent. end): l. 120, 2025¼ artabas per καγκέλλῳ 16⅓ ν. ζ. ἰδ.; P. Oxy. 1913 (555?), l. 61: 800 artabas 5¼ ν. ζ. Ἀλεξ.; P. Oxy. 2022 (VI cent.), l. 3, 440 art. 109¾ sil.; l. 7, 333¾ art. and 6 choenices 106½ sil.

[20] G. Rouillard[2], *op. cit.*, p. 126 gives only the evidence of P. Oxy. I 142 (VI cent.) of a *naulon* of 11 sol. 3½ sil. for 1485¼ artabas.

[21] The earliest cases of ναῦλον quoted by Wallace are Wessely, *Pal. St.*, XX, 93 (probably year 334 A.D.) for the amount of money expended for the ναῦλον: l. 2, θαλασσ⟨σ⟩ίων καὶ ἀργυρικῶν τ[ἰδ]λων, Preis, Cairo 33 (339 A.D.); P. Oxy. 1905

from Africa and Alexandria than they did in the more prosperous years. The life of the population of Rome and later of Byzantium depended to a very large extent on importations from Africa and Egypt.

I think a burden of two million artabas to be sent as *annona* to Byzantium and Heracleia was very heavy for Egyptian conditions in the fourth century.[22] It is quite clear that inflation, dislocation of public finances, and disorganization of public works, taken all together, did great injury to the agriculture of a country which owed its very existence to its system of irrigation. Probably other grain provinces of the Empire and particularly Africa were in a less critical situation than Egypt.

After the foundation of Constantinople in 324, we know that the cereals of Egypt were sent to the new capital and that Rome was fed chiefly by Africa.[23] This arrangement was probably made in the early Byzantine period, when Constantinople was still Byzantium and Diocletian was residing in Nicomedia.[24] The difference in the freight charges between Alexandria and Rome from those between Alexandria and Byzantium was slight: 16 percent of the price of the wheat instead of 12 percent, according to the Edict of Diocletian. The prices of transportation between Africa and Rome and Africa and Byzantium are not indicated. The rate Africa-Rome, l. 45, is not mentioned, and for the other route we have no indication either, but it is probable that the figures were respectively 12 and 16 percent. The possible differences of the price of wheat in the two provinces of Egypt and Africa were normally much higher than 4 percent. Therefore these costs of transport had almost no influence on the distribution of the burden of the *annona* in these two great agricultural provinces of the Empire.

(probably 340–45 A.D. and not late IV or early V century, as the editors suppose), and P. Lips. 64 (368 A.D.) concerning the *naulon* πλοίων θαλασσίων, which shows (l. 21) how this tax was imposed (see the fine introduction of Mitteis, pp. 201 ff.).

[22] The *alimonia* granted to the people of Alexandria in 302 A.D. was a pure measure of necessity and not a political measure, as was supposed by G. Rouillard[2], p. 121 ff.

[23] Evidence collected in Heywood, "Roman Africa," *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV, p. 116 f.

[24] In the Edict of Diocletian, the prices of transportation from Africa to Rome and from Africa to Byzantium are not indicated. The rate from Africa to Rome (l. 45) does not bear any figure and for the second rate we have no indication; but probably the figures were 12 and 16 denarii.

The Annona of Rome and Constantinople

The new conclusion that Egypt in the beginning of the fourth century A.D. exported to Byzantium and Heracleia about two million artabas of wheat reopens the question of the amount of wheat sent to Rome and Byzantium for the *annona*. We cannot give any very accurate figures. Moreover we are quite aware that the supply of wheat sent to Rome and to Constantinople varied with the quantity of wheat that was available in the productive areas of Egypt and Africa, and with the number of people who had to be fed.[25] Rome, at the time of Septimius Severus, needed for its population 75,000 modii of wheat daily. Spartian., H.A., *Vita Severi* XXIII: "(Severus) moriens septem annorum canonem, ita ut cotidiana septuaginta quinque milia modium expendi posse reliquit." This figure of 27,375,000 modii yearly, or 8,212,000 artabas, may be considered as the amount of wheat which had to be imported from the whole Empire to make up the *annona* of Rome. We assume that Rome at the time of Severus was a town of about a million inhabitants, and that each person needed one artaba of wheat a month (litres 29.11 = kg. 21.82, calculating the specific weight of wheat at 0.75). The town needed possibly 12 million artabas of wheat, of which amount about 8 million artabas were supplied by the *annona*. The other 4 million artabas came to Rome from other sources.

When Alexandria, in the age of Justinian, sent usually 8 million artabas of wheat to Constantinople, we suppose that Constantinople was a town of about one million inhabitants and that about

[25] See Oberhummer, in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Constantinopolis, p. 1004. Andreades, Περὶ τοῦ πληθυσμοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Athens (1918), p. 11 ff. gives the indications available for the population of Constantinople in the Byzantine period. The passage from Chrysostom, *Act. Apost. Homilia*, XI, 3 is of no use for our purpose. The *Notitia Dignitatis Orientis* of 413 A.D. states that Constantinople had 4388 houses, but there is no way of calculating the number of inhabitants (Andreades, *ibid.*, p. 12). Ausonius (309–394, *Ordo urbium nobilium*) in the order of the towns mentions first Rome, then Constantinople, Carthage, Alexandria, and Antiochia. The estimate given of the population of Alexandria (which is too high) by Beloch, *Bevölkerung* (1886), p. 481, of 600,000 inhabitants in the first century A.D. is of very little use. The last and only valuable indication for the population of Constantinople is given by the Edict of Justinian XIII, 8, from which, however, Andreades does not draw any definite conclusion.

two-thirds of the required wheat came there through the ἐμβολή of Alexandria.

The two million artabas sent from Alexandria to Herakleia and Byzantium in 316 A.D. probably had to meet the needs of a population of about 250,000. Possibly Constantinople, in the period close to its foundation, was a town of about a third of a million inhabitants, about two-thirds of whom were fed by the *annona* of Alexandria. This figure would agree fairly well with the estimate of Constantinople as a town of about half a million inhabitants in the beginning of the fifth century A.D.[26]

Probably the ἐμβολή was raised from about two million artabas in the age of Constantine to about 4½ at the beginning of the fifth century and to 8 million in the age of Justinian. This rise in figures followed the enormous improvement in the condition of the Egyptian economic system in the later Byzantine period after the nightmare of the fourth century. Assuming that about 8 million aruras were cultivated at the time of Justinian a burden of one artaba was assessed on each arura for the *embole*, i.e., a burden corresponding to a little more than one-tenth of the whole production of Egyptian wheat.

In the fourth century we believe the population of Egypt was much smaller, and the burden of the two million artabas was then much heavier than the 8 million artabas of the sixth century.

With these figures in mind, we shall now try to analyze the data for the *annona* of Rome.

The fundamental figures are (a) Aurel. Victor, *Epit.*, 1, who says that at the time of Augustus 20 million *modii* (= 6 million artabas) were imported to feed Rome; (b) Joseph., *Bell.Judaicum*, II, 386, where it is stated that Africa in the time of Nero supplied Rome for eight months and Egypt for four months "παρέχει . . . τῇ Ῥώμῃ σῖτον μηνῶν τεσσάρων." The passages of Aurelius Victor and Josephus need not be reconciled. Rome at the time of Septimius Severus needed about 8 million artabas to feed its populace. If the figures of Aurelius Victor are reliable, we can only suppose that there was a period during the age of Augustus when Rome

[26] For Cyrenaica and Morocco the figures given by R. M. Heywood must be doubled. See A. Segrè, *Bull. Soc. Royal. d'Arch.*, n. 29 (1934), p. 295. Half the production of Africa was probably in barley, while in Egypt the crop of barley had a rather limited importance. The statement, *op. cit.*, p. 296, that Africa was less important than Egypt for the supply of the annona in the early Imperial age is inaccurate.

received from Egypt nearly all the wheat it needed and a relatively small amount from other countries, chiefly Africa. Doubtless Egypt in a prosperous period could send to Rome 6 million artabas of wheat, and this is proved by the Edict XIII 8 of Justinian. In the time of Nero, if we can rely on Josephus (and I see no reason why we should not) we can reckon that Egypt sent to Rome about 2⅔ million artabas of wheat, while Africa sent 5⅓ artabas. This seems a very reasonable statement. Egypt was obliged to send to Rome about ⅓ artaba of wheat from each arura, or about 1/20–1/30 of its entire crop. This burden was not very heavy.

How was it with Africa? R. M. Heywood, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, "Africa," p. 42, quoting Rivière et Lecq, *Traité pratique*, p. 222, n. 1, says that the French Government reckoned that the natives of Algeria, who live almost entirely on cereals, consumed about 800 lbs. apiece in a year (about 1 kg. each day). This is about the amount of wheat consumed by the Roman legionary. He reckons further (p. 44) that Roman Africa at the end of the principate of Augustus had a total production of about 12 million quintals, starting from the production of cereals of Tunis and Algeria in 1912. These regions produced in 1912 about 17 million quintals of wheat and barley. But even if we assume that the production of cereals in Tunis and Algeria in the early imperial period had been of ca. 12 million quintals, the figures of Heywood are not accurate.

12 million quintals of wheat correspond to 1,600,000,000 litres or about 184,000,000 *modii* = 752 million artabas, which is about the total production of Egypt. But if we include the whole northern coast of Africa from the Egyptian frontiers to the Pillars of Hercules, i.e., Morocco on one side and Cyrenaica on the other, as we must do, we are confronted with a total production of wheat in Africa far exceeding that of Egypt.[27] Africa had a much greater

[27] For the *frumentum* of the *annona* the résumé of Rostovtzeff in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. frumentum, pp. 132 ff. (1912) is still valuable, although the calculations are impaired by inaccurate metrology. On the most controversial questions of Alexandrian and African imports Rostovtzeff is noncommittal, as well as Oertel (*Cambridge Ancient History*, X, 410, n. 1). R. M. Heywood, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V, "Africa," p. 42 ff., apparently misled by T. Frank, *An Economic History of Rome*, and Charlesworth, *Trade Routes*, p. 144, starts with an Egyptian *annona* of 20 million *modii* = 6 million artabas, and assumes that Africa exported an *annona* double that of Egypt, i.e., 40 million *modii* = 12 million artabas. The inhabitants

surplus of wheat than Egypt. But while Egypt had low freight prices because her wheat was largely exported by water, Africa could grow its crops for export only where it could be transported easily by sea. We believe that, at the time of Augustus, Rome was fed with Alexandrian wheat in a proportion of about 6 million artabas against 2 million artabas from Africa, and in the time of Nero and perhaps even in the age of the Severi, Rome received about 2⅔ million artabas of Alexandrian wheat and 5⅓ million artabas of African wheat.

In the second half of the third century the shipment of wheat to Rome was probably not very regular, and the population of Rome was also decreasing. At the beginning of the fourth century A.D. its *annona* depended exclusively on Africa.

Freight Charges for Wheat Cargoes on the Rivers

While we are now fairly well oriented on the costs of freight on the sea, we know very little about transportation costs on land. For the study of the market for cereals in ancient times a study of the cost of land transportation would be of considerable interest, in order to ascertain how far staple products could penetrate into the interior of the different countries. Egypt is the only region of the empire which would supply materials for a study in land transportation. Many pertinent data have been collected by A. C. Johnson, *An Economic Survey*, II, "Egypt," p. 400. In P. Oxy. 522 (II Cent. A.D.; Johnson, *ibid.*, p. 402 and p. 418) the grain from the *annona* is sent at the rate of 21 dr., with some extra charges, for 100 artabas from Oxyrhynchos to Neapolis. The distance is about 450 km. or about 300 Roman miles. The freight corresponds to about 3½ percent of the price of the wheat.

In P. Lond. 948 (Arsinoe, 236 A.D., Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 423) the freight charges for 250 artabas of vegetables from the Arbor of the Grove (Arsinoe) to Oxyrhynchos, about 115 km. or some 77 Roman miles upstream, are about 40 drachmas for 100 artabas. If the same freight were paid for wheat it would result in a charge of about 2½ percent of the value of the wheat for a journey of about 77 Roman miles.

---

of Rome could not eat 18 million artabas of imported wheat, i.e. about 1½ times as much wheat as was required for all the inhabitants of the town. The calculation that about one quarter of the African wheat had to be sent to Rome is inaccurate.

These figures make us skeptical on the explanations of Jacopi and De Grassi of ll. 23–24 of the second fragment of Aphrodisias. The editor supposes that ll. 23–24 mention the rivers. Downstream, 1 *denarius* for each *modius castrensis* for 20 Roman miles, and 2 *denarii* upstream (see Jacopi, *op. cit.*, p. 146). But in these indications of the Edict in ll. 23–24 there are no names of towns located on the rivers. L. 25 indicates that the freight from Ravenna to Aquileia for 1000 *modii* cost 7500 *denarii*, i.e., 7½ *denarii* for each *modius*. The distance between Ravenna and Aquileia in a direct line was ca. 200 km. or about 140 Roman miles, and it seems that this transportation was calculated at the rate of about 1 *denarius* for each 20 Roman miles, as in l. 24.

For the second fragment, l. 17, l. 18, and l. 20, the interpretation of the editor is not entirely satisfactory, although I must confess I have nothing better to suggest.[28]

Freights and Level of Prices

In normal periods freight charges for wheat between the farthest markets of the Empire to which cereals were supplied ranged between 12 and 16 percent of the price of the wheat. Therefore, as far as political factors, monetary hindrances, and trade restrictions did not interfere, the prices of wheat in the regions of the Mediterranean Sea reached by waterways did not differ to any considerable extent. Doubtless the Edict, while attempting to fix the prices of staple products like cereals, had absolutely no result when it tried to fix prices of products like vegetables. However, we may safely assume on the evidence of the Edict that in the earlier imperial period freight rates of 12 percent between Africa and Rome or Alexandria and Byzantium, and 16 percent between Alexandria and Rome, theoretically at least, brought a sort of balance of prices between Africa and Egypt on one hand and Rome and the towns of the East on the other. All the towns

[28] The second fragment, l. 17–49, seems to indicate that cattle were considered equivalent to a certain amount of *modii* of wheat to make the freight of wheat equal the freight of cattle.

I think these lines mean that (horses), mules, and donkeys were calculated for the freights as *modii castrenses*, asses at 60 *modii castrenses*, sheep at 25 *modii*, pigs at 10 *modii*. This interpretation would be substantiated if we could understand (l. 19) "et burdo et asianu(s) in K M uno X sexaginta" as "in K modios sexaginta scil. imputentur," in l. 20.

located far from the sea which had to rely on land transport were, more or less, closed markets.[29]

The evidence of the Diocletian Edict on the cost of freight enables us to use the figures of the prices of Egyptian wheat to reckon prices in the markets of the other coastal towns of the Empire. We are led to believe that a price of 8 drachmas an artaba in Egypt in normal times [30] would correspond to a price not much higher than 10 drachmas or 3 *sestertii* per *modius* in Rome. This price, however, is considered low in the time of Tacitus, while a more normal price was 1 denarius = 4 *sestertii* for a *modius*.[31]

Doubtless the level of prices in the coastal regions of the Empire influenced indirectly the prices in the interior.

4. The *Annona Militaris*

I. Its Definition and Its Value in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries A.D.

The Roman soldiers in the fourth century A.D. received their allowances in *annonae*, *donativa*, and *stipendia*.[1] The *annonae* were fairly constant rations of food (*cellaria*) and wood for heating delivered out of the *arcarica* of the *praefectus praetorio*, while clothing, weapons, horses, etc., which were also supplied to the army, belonged to the *canonica* of the *largitionalia*, i.e., to the administration of the *res privata*.[2] The *annonae* and the *capita*, the

[29] Edict. Diocl. XVII 4 (Tenney Frank, *Econ. Survey*, V. p. 369, Appendix by E. R. Graser) reads: freight charge for a 600 pound camel load per mile den. 8; XVII 5, freight charge for a donkey-load per mile den. 4. A load of 600 pounds of wheat corresponded to 29.63 *modii castrenses* at the price of 2963 *denarii*. The freight amounted to 0.27% of the value of the wheat for each mile. According to Edict. Diocl. XVII 4 and 5 the freight of a camel-load for about 40 miles would cost as much as the freight by ship from Alexandria to Byzantium.

[30] See Angelo Segrè, *Circolazione*, p. 78 ff.

[31] In the latter part of the first century the regular price of wheat at Antioch in Pisidia was 8–9 asses a *modius* and at a time of scarcity the proconsul in an edict limited it to 1 denarius a modius, M. Robinson, *Trans. Am. Philol. Ass.*, LV (1924), 5–20; *Journal of Roman Studies*, XVI (1926), 116 ff.; T. R. S. Broughton, *Econ. Survey*, IV, p. 879. This price, which corresponded rather well to the Egyptian prices of the same age, does not mean much for the general level of prices in this period, because Antioch in Pisidia probably had to rely on the local market, owing to its position in the interior of Asia Minor.

---

[1] Grosse, *Römische Militärgeschichte* (1920), p. 243.

[2] C. Just. XII 35, 15; Th. I 22, 4, VI 24, 2, VIII 3, 10; C. Just. I 27, 20 ff. and

allowances for horses or beasts of burden, were proportioned to the rank of the soldiers.[3] The *annona militaris* was mostly supplied in kind; in rare cases soldiers received its equivalent in money (*annona adaerata*).[4]

The prices of the *annonae* could oscillate widely.[5] *Annonae* bought on a free market could be ideal measures of the purchasing power of money as far as it refers to food.

The best and most complete evidence on the Byzantine annona, as far as I know, is offered by P. Oxy. 1920 (550–560), by P. Oxy. 2046, and by some minor texts of the same group, all closely connected. Although carefully published with accurate introductions, these texts have not yet been used for the study of the Byzantine *annona*.

P. Oxy. 1920 indicates the amounts of the *annonae* for στρατιῶται, σύμμαχοι, *cancellarii*, *cursores*, σύμμαχοι ῥιπαρίων, *buccelarii*, etc. The prices of the commodities are also indicated: 80 pounds of bread are reckoned as 1 artaba of wheat at 1/10 sol.; in P. Oxy. 1920, l. 16, meat is reckoned at 1/120 sol. per pound; oil at 1/45 sol. per sextarius, wine at 1/25 sol. per διπλοῦν of 6 sextarii or at 1/150 sol. per sextarius. A combined allowance of wood per day for the soldiers and the *cancellarii* etc., of two κεντηνάρια of wood for the σύμμαχοι of ll. 6–7, and an arura of fodder daily for the entire company are further indicated.[6]

The data of the Byzantine military *annonae* are recapitulated in the table on the following page:

These data show how an *annona* was calculated. Not all the soldiers received the same *annonae* (C. VII, 4, 1). In P. Oxy. 1920,

---

22 ff. Grosse, p. 243. But the vestes are sometimes considered as annonae, see e.g., De Ruggiero, *Dizionario Epigrafico*, s.v. annona (militaris).

[3] Th. VII, 4, 1: "annonas suae congruas dignitati."

[4] See p. 409 ff.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Food was valued according to the season. See, for the Imperial period, SB. 6957–76, quoted by A. Ch. Johnson in Tenney Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, II, 671. In the Byzantine period soldiers in military expeditions, according to C. Th. VII, 4, 6 (360), C. Just. XII, 37, 1; cp. Th. VII, 4, 29, 4, 25; 5, 2, received a biscuit (*buccelatum*) each two days, and each third day bread, bacon every other day (*laridum*) or lamb, wine for drinking, with vinegar, which was used for the customary military drink, the *posca*, as well as salt and oil (Grosse, p. 242). The *annona* of the soldiers serving in Egypt was about the same. See also Grosse, pp. 243 and 246.

42, 36 στρατιῶται received 43 *annonae* and l. 41 a *cancellarius*, a *cursor*, and 2 *ostiarii* (four *persons*) received five *annonae*; the *contubernales* an *annona* each and one *capitum*; in l. 44, 29 *buccellarii* received 30 *annonae* and 27 *capita*; the παιδάρια ½ *annona*. The allowance of a στρατιώτης, $^{43}/_{36}$ of an *annona*, is

	Bread	Meat	Oil	Wine	Daily Allowance for Annona
ll. 3–5 *στρατιῶται*	4 pounds $\frac{1.8}{360}$ sol.	1 pound $\frac{3}{360}$ sol.	$\frac{1}{8}$ sext. $\frac{1}{360}$ sol.	2 sext. $\frac{4.8}{360}$ sol. =	$\frac{10.6}{360}$ sol.
ll. 6–7 *σύμμαχοι*	3 pounds $\frac{1.35}{360}$ sol.	$\frac{1}{2}$ pound $\frac{1.5}{360}$ sol.	$\frac{1}{10}$ sext. $\frac{0.8}{360}$ sol.	1 sext. $\frac{2.4}{360}$ sol. =	$\frac{6.05}{360}$ sol.
ll. 8–10 *cancellarius cursores*, etc.	4 pounds $\frac{1.8}{360}$ sol.	1 pound $\frac{3}{360}$ sol.	$\frac{5}{48}$ sext. $\frac{0.833}{360}$ sol.	2 sext. $\frac{4.8}{360}$ sol. =	$\frac{10.43}{360}$ sol.
σύμμαχοι ῥιπαρίων	3 pounds $\frac{1.35}{360}$ sol.	$\frac{1}{2}$ pound $\frac{1.5}{360}$ sol.	$\frac{1}{10}$ sext. $\frac{0.8}{360}$ sol.	$\frac{1}{2}$ sext. $\frac{1.2}{360}$ sol. =	$\frac{4.85}{360}$ sol.

valued at 10.6 sol. On this basis we may calculate an *annona* of 8.87 sol., while, should we reckon the *annonae* on the basis of the allowance of the *cancellarii*, *cursores*, etc., the *annona* would be ⅘ of 10.43 sol. or 8.345 sol. These figures are approximate, but on this basis I think we may reckon that an *annona* in P. Oxy. 1920 and 2046 corresponded to a yearly expense for food of about 8½ solidi. Usually in the legal texts the *annona* is reck-

oned much lower because the prices were fixed by the government at a very low level.

Nov. Val. XIII, 3 (445) values the *annona* for a soldier in Africa at 4 solidi. Valentinianus, to ease the supply of the *annona* for the provinciales, allows them to pay it in money: "Has autem militares annonas cum provinciales pro longiqui difficultate itineris in adaeratione persolverint, unius annonae adaeratio quattuor per annum solidis aestimetur."

The prices of this *adaeratio* were very low: Wheat (*triticum*) $\frac{1}{40}$ solidus per modius, wine $\frac{1}{200}$ sol. per *sextarius italicus*, meat (*caro verbericina*) $\frac{1}{220}$ sol. per pound. An *annona* of about four solidi in Africa at these prices could be composed of three pounds of bread, one pound of meat, $\frac{1}{10}$ sext. of oil, and one sextarius of wine.[7] I think that such an *annona* might be considered as a sort of standard for the Byzantine period. In the year 534 the *annona* in Africa and Sardinia was reckoned at five solidi instead of four, and the *capitum* at four solidi (C. Just. I, 27, 1, 22 ff.; 2, 20 ff.).[8] Very often *annonae* were probably forcibly maintained at these prices in Egypt during the age of Justinian, keeping commodity prices for the army very low.[9]

[7] The total of this *annona* would amount to 4,3 sol. yearly. This *annona* is a little smaller than the annona of P. Oxy. 1920 and 2046, which would correspond to about three and a half pounds of bread, three quarters of a pound of meat, one tenth sextarius of oil, one and a half sextarius of wine, or about 4.88 solidi, figured at the prices of Nov. Val. XIII, 3 (445).

[8] Grosse, ibid., p. 246. These texts give the allowance of officers of different ranks and of soldiers in *annonae* and *capita*, for the provinces of Africa and Sardinia. Prices here are still calculated far under the average.

[9] See, as typical cases of *adaerationes* at low prices, P. Cairo 67050, 67320, 67289, 67175. P. Cairo 67050 (VI century), 8750 (λίτραι) *οἰνοκρέων ὑπὲρ ἀννωνῶν στρατιωτῶν* 5000 @ $\frac{1}{100}$ sol. each. See Gelzer for the *annona* (*Archiv. f. Papyrusf.*, V, 1913, p. 352). Psates, an *actuarius* of the numerus of Antaiopolis, gives the receipt of the annona to some officers of Aphrodito. See also P. Cairo 67051, both connected with P. Cairo 67020 (541?). See Gelzer, *Byz. Verwaltung*, p. 39–41: The *praeses* of Thebais Inferior gives the order to the villagers, until the *predelegatio* comes, to give 203 artabas of wheat to the soldiers of the *numerus* of Antaiopolis through the *actuarius*, at the *adaeratio* of 40 modii a solidus, and 8750 pounds of *οἰνόκρεον*, probably a part of them, at $\frac{1}{200}$ sol. each pound. We are confronted with another *adaeratio* for soldiers in P Cairo 67145. Wine was then hought by an *actuarius*. An *ἀγγεῖον* equals 6 *ῥόγαι*; 15½ *ῥόγαι* equal 1 siliqua. Oil of raphanus is bought by the *actuarius* at 1 sil. each 372 *ῥόγαι* equal to 74.4 sext., each *ῥόγη* of oil being equal to one fifth sext. For more particulars of the text, see the introduction to Maspero, p. 78 ff.

II. The Annona in the Period of Inflation between 301 and the Fifth Century

The *annona* was reckoned at five *solidi* in the legal texts of the time of Justinian, but at about eight *solidi* in P. Oxy. 1920 and 2046, with prices not very different from those of the free market.[10]

These prices in gold were much below those of the early Byzantine period, when commodity prices in gold were much higher than in the age of Justinian. One of the reasons which induced Diocletian to issue his famous Edict *De pretiis rerum venalium* was the necessity of fixing a basis for his taxation [11] and for the *annona militaris* and the *annona civica*.[12]

A standard *annona* (see p. 408 ff.) which, at the time of Justinian could be reckoned at five solidi, would cost 19.20 *solidi* at the prices of the Edict of Diocletian,[13] and still more in the earlier Constantinian age. In the period about 316, an artaba of wheat was reckoned at a solidus,[14] a sextarius of wine at about $\frac{1}{50}$

[10] The great difference in *adaeratio* prices is found in the commodities wine, oil, and meat; the price of wheat was not far from the market price.

[11] See *Byzantion*, XV (1941), p. 279.

[12] In Edict, preamble, Tenney Frank, *Econ. Survey*, V, 314: "Quis ergo nesciat utilitatibus publicis insidi(tricem audaciam quac(umque exercitus nostros dirigi communis omnium (salus postulat non per vicos modo aut per oppid)a sed in omni itinere animo sectio(nis occurrere pretia venalium rerum non quadruplo aut oct)uplo ita extor(quere ut nomina estimonis et facti explicare humanae linguae ratio) non possit; (denique interdum distractione unius rei donativo militem stipendio)que pri(vari et omnem totius orbis ad sustinendos exercitus collationem detest)andis (quaestibus diripientium cedere, ut manu propria spem militiae suae et) emeri(tos labores milites nostri sectoribus omnium comferre videantur, quo depredatores ipsius reipublicae tantum in dies rapiant quantum habere nesciant." The connections between the Edict of Diocletian and the *annona* of the soldiers appear also from Mal. 307, 2 f. For the edict as protection for the interests of the soldiers, see K. Stade, *Der Politiker Diocletian und die letzte grosse Christenverfolgung* (1926), p. 62 ff.

[13] We reckon 3 pounds of bread as equal to $\frac{1}{16\,2/3}$ artaba = $\frac{1}{5}$ *modius castrensis* = 20 denarii. 1 pound of meat, *caro bubula*, in Edict IV, 46, at 8 den., pork at 12 den., Edict IV, 1a. 1 sext. wine, *vini rustici italicum sext. unum*, 8 den. in Edict II, 10. $\frac{1}{10}$ sext. of oil at 12 den. if *oleum cibarium*, Edict II, 3 or 8 den. if *oleum raphaninum*, which was used in Egypt in that period for the Army. See e.g., P Cairo 67145 (VI Cent.) of Aphrodito. Using figures of the Edict, and assuming that soldiers consumed the cheapest sort of meat, oil, and wine, the *annona* of a soldier would be 37.20 denarii each day, a sum equal to $\frac{1}{22.3}$ aureus of Diocletian per day or 16 aurei of Diocletian for 360 days or 19.2 sol. of 4 grammata.

[14] See *Byzantion*, XV (1941), 261.

solidus,[15] probably very near to the price of a pound of meat.[16]

For the year 316, the yearly *annona* of 13½ artabas of wheat, 360 sextarii of wine, 360 pounds of meat, 36 sextarii of oil, stood at about 30 solidi.[17] Prices of *capita* depended on the price of barley which, in the early Byzantine period, was very near that of wheat.[18] The prices of the annona in the different Byzantine periods are given in the following table:

Source	Year	Approximate Price of *Annona*
Edict D.p.r.v. (Diocletian)	301	19.20 sol.
See p. 410	316	30 sol.
Nov. Val. XIII, 3 (see p. 409)	445	4 sol. but average cost probably 8 sol.
C. Just. I, 27, 1 (see p. 409)	534	5 sol. but average cost probably 8 sol.
P. Oxy. 1920 and 2046	VI Cent.	About 8 sol.

III. The Cost of Maintaining a Soldier in the Imperial and Byzantine Armies

There was a great difference between the Egyptian army of the time of the Empire and the army of the Byzantine age. Roman soldiers in the legion as well as in the *auxilia* were chiefly Alexandrians and *metropolitae*. Outside of Egypt in the East they

[15] In P. Oxy. 2114 (316) of Oxyrhynchos, wine for the *annona* was reckoned at 65 den. the sextarius. Calculating a solidus at ca. 2. tal. (see *Byzantion*, XV, 1941, p. 250) a sextarius of wine cost ca. 1/50 solidus.

[16] A pound of pork was reckoned in Edict D.p.r.v., 4, 1a, at 12 den., beef at 8 den. i.e., 1/60 and 1/90 sol. In P. Oxy. XV 1920 (end of VI cent.), which relates to the *annona* (see p. 408), a pound of meat was reckoned at 1/120 sol. As a rule a pound of cheap meat in the Egyptian papyri was reckoned at a price very close to that of a sextarius of wine. See, e.g., P. Lond. III 934 (end of IV cent.), where wine was reckoned at 33 myr. den., probably about 1/120 sol., P. Oxy. XIV, 1735 (390), where the solidus was at 3900 myr. den. and a pound of meat was at 30 myr.

[17] Prices of these commodities are indicated on p. 410. The sum would be 27.9 solidi plus 36 sext. of oil.

[18] See A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV (1941), 261.

were probably citizens of Greek towns or Greeks descended from κάτοικοι living among the indigenous peasants.

In Egypt even Egyptians served, in some cases in the legions, and more frequently in the *auxilia*, but we may safely suppose that until the period of the Severi the Roman Army in the Eastern provinces was chiefly recruited among the "Ἕλληνες" [19] and the sons of soldiers.

Service in the Roman Imperial Army was as a rule limited to a privileged category of people.

The soldiers of the Byzantine era, on the other hand, were recruited mostly among the peasants, if not actually among the *barbari* and among the *castrenses*. Byzantine soldiers, who as a rule did not belong to the higher classes of Byzantine society, had a lower social position than the soldiers of the Empire. But the moral, intellectual and economic standards of Byzantine society were debased in comparison with Imperial standards.

In the Byzantine period the military career offered a brilliant opportunity for a few enterprising men, but the mass of the soldiers had no other expectation than to become veterans and enjoy the grants of the *praemia militiae*.[20] This difference in the condition of the Imperial and the Byzantine soldier explains why the Roman soldier received relatively high pay in money, but no money for his enlistment, while the Byzantine soldier was rewarded chiefly with his *annonae*, but was in some sense bought by the government when engaged in the military service.

The 30 solidi, plus *vestis* and *sumptus* [21] represented a sort of price, and the soldier's engagement in the army had a character in some ways akin to a *paramone*.[22] Therefore the recruits, if engaged

[19] See A. Segrè, *Rendicont. Accad. Rom. Pont. d'Arch.*, XLVI (1940), 191.

[20] The Roman Imperial Army confronts us with a division of classes. The officer's career was open to individuals of senatorial and equestrian rank, while plebeians had a military career open to them only after the period of Diocletian. The democratization of the army which began with Severus increased greatly with Gallienus and later with Diocletian and his successors. See Grosse, *op. cit.*, p. 12 f. But I think that the reform of the year 297, which abolished the *politeumata*, had no political influence on the recruitment of the army, because as early as the end of the second century A.D. soldiers of the Eastern provinces were no longer recruited solely among the Hellenes.

[21] See p. 421 ff.

[22] The sons of soldiers may or may not have received the 30 solidi. Did the coloni glebae adscripti receive the 30 solidi when recruited or did their landlord?

with the 30 solidi in a sort of *paramone*, served, like most *paramonarii*, not for pay, but for a master who maintained them, paying their living expenses.

These considerations may explain why the Byzantine soldiers received from the Administration the *aurum tironicum* and their living expenses, and not a salary. After these indications we show how the Roman *stipendium* was changed in the third century, little by little, into *annonae* and *donativa*.[23]

Obviously the *annona* represented only a part, although the biggest, of the allowance of a Byzantine soldier. Expenses for clothing and weapons cannot be easily calculated. It seems, however, that the cost of *vestis*, the weapons, and other articles used by the soldiers was paid to the *milites* from the cash of the *largitionalia*, under the same system as the *annonae*, directly from the military administration, as in present-day armies. Officers received a pay which was expected to defray their living expenses, whereas the privates' pay was nominal.

It is known that Byzantine soldiers received *annonae*, *donativa* and *stipendia*.[24] The *donativa*, since the time of the Republic, had been paid to the soldiers at the accession of an Emperor, at festivals, and very often to keep the troops in a good mood. These *donativa* were paid regularly on the first of January, on the anniversary of the foundation of Rome, and the anniversary of the foundation of Constantinople. Eventually the *donativum* in the early Byzantine age was consolidated with the *stipendium*, so that *donativum* and *stipendium* appear to mean the same thing.[25] These *donativa* were probably not very high.[26] But the *immunitates* of the soldiers and eventually even of their wives during military service, the grants of the Emperors, and the *immunitates* of *veterani* were a very important *praemium militiae*.[27] We cannot appreciate some of the fundamental characteristics of the

[23] See D. van Berchem, *Memoires de la soc. nat. des antiquaires de France*, LXXX (1937), 124 ff.; Alföldi, CAH XII, p. 221.

[24] Grosse, p. 243.

[25] See Fiebiger, *Donativum*, Pauly-Wissowa, s.v., Seeck, *Unterg. d. ant. Welt*, p. 254, 280 f., Grosse, *loc. cit.*, p. 243 ff.

[26] The *donativum* of Julian, when he became emperor, of 5 sol. and 1 pound of silver to each soldier (about 20 solidi), see Amm., XX, 4, 18, is doubtless a very unusual donativum.

[27] See, *e.g.*, Th. VII, 20, 3, 8, and Seeck, *Untergang*, p. 539–540.

Byzantine army if we do not compare its condition with that of the army of the first and second centuries A.D.

As is well known, at the end of the reign of Augustus a Roman legionary received 225 denarii yearly, divided into three *stipendia*, and with this sum of money he provided his food, clothing, weapons, and lodging.[28] Domitian added a fourth *stipendium* to the pay of the legionaries, who thus received 300 denarii yearly at the end of the first century A.D.[29] Later emperors had to raise the *stipendium* of the soldiers in proportion to the purchasing power of the denarius.[30]

These data, however, are not completely confirmed by Egyptian evidence. The *stipendia* of the legionaries, instead of 75 denarii, or 300 drachmas, were reckoned at 248 drachmas. For the *stipendia* of the *auxilia* we have no certain evidence, and no data at all are available for the *stipendia* of the soldiers in the third century A.D.[31] But the accounts of the Roman soldiers of the

[28] Tacitus, *Ann.*, I, 17: "Denis in diem assibus animam et corpus aestimari; hinc vestem, arma, tentoria, . . . redimi, nec aliud levamentum quam si certis sub legibus militia iniretur, ut singulos denarios mererent." We have no evidence that the stipendia of the auxilia in this period were different from the stipendia of the legions. See for the annual expenses of the Roman army and navy in the age of Augustus Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V, 4 ff.

[29] Suet. Dom. 7. "Addidit et quartum stipendium militi aureos ternos."

[30] Domaszewski, "Der Truppensold der Kaiserzeit," *N. Heidelb. Jahrb.*, X, (1900), 230, assumes that Commodus added a fifth stipendium for praetorians and legionarii (1250 and 375 den. respectively) and that under Severus the legionarii received 500 den., under Caracalla, 750. The stipendium of the *cohortes praetoriae* seems to have been 750 denarii at the death of Augustus (Tac., *Ann.*, I, 17, Festus s.v. *praetoria cohors*); the double of that received by other soldiers in 27 B.C., Dio 53, 11.

[31] The passing of legionaries into the *auxilia* was not felt as a degradation (BGU 696, 156 A.D.). Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 393, and *Chrest.*, p. 538, shows that, at least after the year 156, the stipendia of the auxilia very probably were no smaller than those of the legions. In P. Berl. ined. 6866A (see Lesquier, *op. cit.*, p. 250), a native Egyptian, probably serving in the auxiliary forces as a *lorictitis*, had a deposit of 100 denarii and an allowance of 75 denarii for travelling expenses. His stipendium was given as 84 denarii, 15¾ ob. If the stipendium represents the pay for a term of four months, the annual stipend of a *lorictitis* was approximately 1014 den. 4 ob. in A.D. 180 (Johnson, *ibid.*, p. 671 f.). But probably the stipendium was reckoned for three months. For the different position of the auxiliarii and the legionarii see Angelo Segrè, *Journ. of Rom. Studies*, XXX (1940), 153 f., P. S. I. 1026, Grassi, *Aegyptus*, X 1930 p. 242 and Dessau 2487 referring to the Adlocutio Hadriani to the African army at Lambesis: "eq. coh. VI Commagenorum-Difficile est cohortales equites etiam per se placere, difficilius post alacrem exercitationem non displicere: alia spatia campi, alius iaculantium numerus, frequens dextrator, Cantabricus densus, equorum forma, armorum cultus pro stipendii modo," etc.

first and second centuries are very valuable to us for the purpose of comparison between the conditions in the Imperial and Byzantine troops.

Lesquier (*L'armée romaine*, p. 260) on the basis of P. Gen. Lat. I (80–4 A.D.), reckons the budget of an Egyptian legionary as follows:

3 stipendia		744 drachmas
for *faenaria*	30	
for *victum*	240	
for *caligae* and *fasciae*	36	
for *saturnalicium*	20	
ad *signa*	4	
		330
Balance		414

For the *vestimenta* appears an annual expense of not less than 146 drachmas (p. 256 and 260). Then there were the weapons, which cost 412 drachmas and were paid for by the soldiers. According to Lesquier (*op. cit.*, p. 261) the soldiers were badly paid and had to count on *donativa*. But if we consider the standard of living of the populace of Egypt, the Roman soldiers were not badly remunerated. A Roman legionary in Egypt paid 240 drachmas yearly for his food. These 240 drachmas in the years 81–83 corresponded in purchasing power to a Byzantine annona, and perhaps to the annona of a στρατιώτης (see p. 408) if we reckon with the prices of *adaeratio* in the Imperial period. In wheat five solidi of the annona of Justinian corresponded to about fifty artabas, while 240 drachmas corresponded to about 60 artabas.[32] We may reckon that about 240 drachmas were spent for a soldier's food; to wit, 81 drachmas for bread, 13½ artabas at 6 drachmas each; about 80 drachmas for wine, 360 sextarii at 1.55 oboli each; and about 80 drachmas for meat at about 1.55 oboli a pound.[33] A Roman legionary paid about one third of his entire

[32] Segrè, *Circolazione*, p. 22 ff. For more data on prices of commodities in the Imperial period see A. C. Johnson in Tenney Frank, *Economic Survey*, II: living expenses, p. 301 ff., wages, p. 306 ff., wheat, p. 310 ff., wine, p. 314 ff., clothing, p. 318 ff. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 671, thinks that the average cost of feeding a soldier could hardly have reached the total of 240 dr. a year in the first century, and it is evident that neither food nor clothing were provided at cost.

[33] The price of wine for the annona is confirmed by an unpublished P.S.I. (220 A.D.) of Oxyrhynchus, where the ἐπιμελητής of the *annona* delivers

stipendium for his food. Reckoning his food as one *annona*, a Roman legionary had a *stipendium* which, at the low prices of the *annona*, corresponded to three *annonae*, or to about two *annonae* at the prevailing market prices. The legionary received in addition the *donativa* and the *praemia militiae* when discharged with an *honesta missio*. A Byzantine στρατιώτης, whose rank was equivalent to the legionary's, received one and a quarter *annonae*, and his equipment and new *vestes militares* from the Government each year.[34] The Roman soldier had to buy all his necessities with what remained of his *stipendium* after the cost of his food was deducted. Comparing what a private of the Byzantine period spent for clothing and weapons and maintenance with the similar expenses of the Imperial soldier, we find that the Byzantine apparently needed also about three *annonae*, but as a matter of fact his expenses were lower.[35]

The soldier of the Roman army did not marry, but used to live with his family in the *castra*; his *filii castrenses* were supposed to remain in the army (see A. Segrè, *Rendiconti Acc. Pont.*, XLVII [1941], 167 ff). Legally there was no appreciable change in the condition of the *familiae iuris gentium* in the Imperial period (see

---

wine at 2 ob. each *sextarius castrensis*. Prices in Egypt in the beginning of the third century A.D. are, as we know, at a level twice as high as in the first and second. (See A. Segrè, *Circolazione*, p. 26; *Metrologia*, p. 433; *Byzantion*, XV (1940–41), 259 ff.) Therefore the price of a *sextarius castrensis* given by the *annona* in the first and second centuries may be about one and a half to two oboli each sextarius. In this case, reckoning the *ceramion* of 6 *choes* equal to the artaba of 40 choenices, (see A. Segrè, *Symbolae Osloenses*, XIII, (1934), p. 69 ff.) or 53⅓ *sextarii castrenses* (see *Byzantion*, XV, 1941, p. 259) the price of a *ceramion* in the I–II century would be between 10 and 13⅓ drachmas (see *Symbolae Osloenses*, XIII, (1934), p. 72).

[34] The expense of clothing a Roman soldier is hard to calculate. For clothing the individual (Johnson, *Economic Survey*, II, 670) was allowed to consult his personal tastes and needs. Thus Q. Julius Proculus, in P. Gen. lat. I (Johnson, p. 407, A.D. 81–3?) spent 206 drachmas in a year on clothing, while Germanus (*ibid.*) spent 246 drachmas, rather extravagant sums in comparison with the amount spent for clothing in Egypt (Johnson, *ibid.*, p. 304 ff. and 318 ff.). If we remember that a Byzantine recruit received six solidi for clothing and minor expenses, the expenses of Proculus and Germanus corresponded to about the whole *vestis militaris* of a Byzantine recruit, a chlamys, a στιχάριον and a pallium (see p. 419) and that therefore they were doubtless higher than the yearly usual expenses for the clothing of a private.

[35] Prices for clothing, if government-fixed rates for the *anabolica* are used as a standard, were lower in the Byzantine period, because in the Roman period clothes were bought mostly in a free market.

A. Segrè, *op. cit.*, p. 173 ff.). Later it was acknowledged that the *annona* was for the benefit of the soldiers and their families (Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 26, 28). A soldier's children remained in their father's matricula, as *adcrescentes* (Th. VI, 24, 2; VII, 1, 11, 14).[36]

The standard of living of a Byzantine soldier was better than that of an unskilled worker. The *annona* of a private, amounting to four or five *solidi* in the sixth, seventh, and beginning of the eighth century, corresponds to the pay of an unskilled worker in a state of half-liberty (see A. Segrè, *Circolazione*, p. 120 ff.). In the edict of Diocletian, VII, 1 ff., the pay of an unqualified worker, *operarius rusticus*, with maintenance, a *pastor*, a *mulio*, is 25 denarii a day, which corresponds to 7½ *modii castrenses* or 2¼ artabas of wheat per month, or about one gold solidus. The pay of the majority of the workers, *lapidarii*, *fabri*, *calcicoctores*, *fabri ferrarii*, *pastores*, *camelarii*, was twice that of the unskilled worker, or 4½ artabas — about 2 *solidi* a month.[37] The Roman legionary received about 60 drachmas a month, while the average wage of an unskilled Egyptian workman in the same period varied between 20 and 40 drachmas. The condition of a Roman legionary in the second century A.D. was much better than the condition of an unskilled Egyptian workman. But this difference appears greater in the Roman period than in the Byzantine, as is also to be expected. Moreover the Roman soldier legally was supposed to be single, his victuals were very cheap, and he had the opportunity to save a *peculium* during his term of service. When the *honesta missio* was granted he had the privilege of the veterans.[38]

In the Byzantine period the condition of a soldier was also privileged in comparison with that of an unskilled worker. The Byzantine soldier received the *annona*, the *vestes*, the *donativa*, tax-exemption, the *praemia militiae* and later the grants of the

[36] Grosse, p. 205. The *paidaria* of P. Oxy. 1920 and 2026 (see p. 408) might have been sons of soldiers. The *adcrescentes* in the East received an allowance in wheat as *annona* (Th. VI, 24, 2; VII, 5, 1, 4, 17, 28; X, 1, 17; the first case known being in BGU 316 (359 A.D.) of Ascalona, but the disposition was limited to Oriens and Egypt in the year 409 (Th. VII, 4, 31) and forbidden in the West (Th. VII, 1, 11; *Vita Gordiani*, 28, 3; Th. VIII, 5, 1; Grosse, p. 205).

[37] The pay of unskilled workmen with maintenance in the Edict of Diocletian is more than twice the real pay of an unskilled Egyptian workman.

[38] For the condition of soldiers in the auxilia, see Lesquier, p. 252; Johnson, p. 672.

veterans.[39] However it does not appear that peasants were eager to become soldiers, and on the other hand soldiers often turned into robbers.

IV. The Vestis Militaris and Other Land Taxes Levied for Military Purposes

P. Oxy. 1905 gives us an indirect method of calculating the expenses of the soldiers of the Byzantine Army for their vestes and other military equipment. P. Oxy. 1905, which is attributed by its editors to the fourth or fifth century A.D., is a *μερισμός* of the aruras for the 15th indiction. The aruras are assessed as follows:

vestes, 1 *χλαμύς* ..... assessed on 243 aruras
1 *στιχάριον* ..... assessed on 175 aruras
1 *πάλλιον* ..... assessed on 1925 aruras

1 *χλαμύς* $\frac{11}{12}$ *στιχάριον* in price, l. 5

χρυσ. βουρδόνων	each arura had to pay	$\frac{1}{46\frac{1}{4}}$ scruple
χρ. τιρώνων	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{20\frac{3}{4}}$ scruple
ναῦλον θαλαττίων(?)[40]	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{243}$ scruple
[*π*]*ρ*[*ι*]*μιπίλου*	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{1660}$ scruple
ἀμμωνιακῆς	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{4100}$ scruple
ναῦλον Κλήμεντος	" " " " "	7500 denarii
?[*βοῶ*]*ν καὶ ὄ*<*ν*>*ων*	" " " " "	5000 denarii

These last items are very small.

From some considerations on the *aurum burdonis* and the *primipili*, I suppose that P. Oxy. 1905 belongs to approximately 370.[41] All the taxes of P. Oxy. 1905 belong to the *largitionalia*

[38] Two very instructive series of documents illustrate the prosperous life of soldiers in Elephantine and the oppressed life of peasants of the village of Aphrodito; the former may be found in P. Lond. V and P. Mon., the latter in P. Cairo Maspero I–III. See Rostovtzeff, *Soc. and econ. history*, p. 630.

[40] The meaning of *θαλαττίων* is uncertain.

[41] P. Lips. 87, a receipt for *χρυσὸς βουρδόνων καὶ πριμιπίλου* from the end of the

except the *ναῦλα θαλαττίων*, which would belong to the class of *ἐμβολή* with *ναῦλα* and *τρόφιμον* of Alexandria. We do not know whether the assessment of the *aruratione*s was made separately from the different offices of the Byzantine administration.[42] The contributions of the land tax for the *vestis militaris* are:[43] from each 243 aruras a *χλαμύς*, from each 175 aruras a *στιχάριον*, and from each 1945 aruras a *πάλλιον*. Each *χλαμύς* (l. 6) is reckoned as $^{11}/_{12}$ of a *στιχάριον*.[44] In the early Byzantine period the *vestis militaris* was supplied partly by handicraftsmen [45] scattered in the villages and partly by the Imperial factories.[46]

IV Century, probably after 370 (see other texts of the same period). The receipt for the *πριμίπιλον* = 7/8 scruples. According to the proportion of P. Oxy. 1905, the *χρυσὸς βουρδ.* had to be sol. $\frac{7}{3^2 \times 8\frac{36}{37}}$, equal to about $^7/_{288}$ or $^1/_{41}$ sol. The amount in P. Lips. 87 seems $^1/_{48} + {}^1/_{192} = {}^5/_{192} = 1/38\frac{2}{5}$, corresponding nearly exactly. Very probably P. Oxy. 1905 and P. Lips. 87 are of the same year because it is not probable that the ratio between the *aurum burdonis* and the *aurum primipili* remained constant throughout a long period. Figures in denarii in P Oxy. 1905 indicate a date perhaps still earlier. In P Oxy. 2001, 3 (466) 400 myriads of denarii are paid for *aurum burdonis*, *primipili* and *tironis*. As for the *chrysargyron*, debased money was accepted instead of gold.

[42] For the *vestis militaris* and the *aurum tironicum* see p. 418 ff. In the Edict Just. XIII of the year 538 three great divisions of taxes were recognized (see Gelzer, *Studien zur Byz. Verwaltung*, 1903, p. 37 ff.). (1) *ἐμβολή* with *ναῦλα* and *τρόφιμον* of Alexandria. (2) *εἴσπραξις τῶν δημοσίων φόρων*. These *φόροι* went to the cash of the *praefectus praetorio*. In the time of Justinian there were two funds, the *γενική* and the *ἰδική*. These taxes are called *arcarica* (Nov. Major. II, 1 [458] and VII, 16 [485]). The *annona militaris* was paid to the *arca* of the *praefectus praetorio*, after Constantine (Zosim. II, 33, 4) until the time of Zosimus (about 500 A.D.). See also the provisions of C. Th. VII, 4, "de erogatione militaris annonae." The *annona militaris* refers not only to the *militia armata* but also to the *cohortalis* and *palatina* (Th. VII, 4, 19). (3) *largitionalia*, to which belonged all the taxes which went to the *sacrae largitiones*, actually all the taxation which did not belong to the *embola* and to the *annona militaris* (C. Th. VII, 6, 2, [368]). The *canon vestium* went to the *largitiones* also when it was adaerated (VII, 6, 5, 432) as most of the taxes in money, when they did not refer to the *annona*, adaerated. The banks of the *largitiones* were the *θησαυροί*.

[43] The *vestis militaris* must be deposited in the thesauri of the *praepositus largitionis* (Th. VIII, 5, 48, 386).

[44] I think that this is the correct interpretation of 1. 6.

[45] P. Oxy. 1448 (318) payment of *στιχάρια* and pallia by villages, cp. P. Oxy. 1424 and 1425, both about 318, P. Lond. 1259 III, p. 239 (IV cent.) with payment in fractions of *χλαμύδες*.

[46] See Persson, *Staat und Manufaktur*, 1923, p. 99 ff., which quotes the Imperial factories of C. Th. VII, 65 = C. Just. XII, 39, 4 (423); C. Th. VII, 6, 4 = C. Just. XII, 39, 3 (396) and C. Th. X, 20, 6 (372).

veterans.[39] However it does not appear that peasants were eager to become soldiers, and on the other hand soldiers often turned into robbers.

IV. The Vestis Militaris and Other Land Taxes Levied for Military Purposes

P. Oxy. 1905 gives us an indirect method of calculating the expenses of the soldiers of the Byzantine Army for their vestes and other military equipment. P. Oxy. 1905, which is attributed by its editors to the fourth or fifth century A.D., is a *μερισμός* of the aruras for the 15th indiction. The aruras are assessed as follows:

vestes, 1 *χλαμύς* ..... assessed on 243 aruras
1 *στιχάριον* ..... assessed on 175 aruras
1 *πάλλιον* ..... assessed on 1925 aruras

1 *χλαμύς* $\frac{11}{12}$ *στιχάριον* in price, l. 5

χρυσ. βουρδόνων	each arura had to pay	$\frac{1}{46\frac{1}{4}}$ scruple
χρ. τιρώνων	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{20\frac{3}{4}}$ scruple
ναῦλον θαλαττίων(?)[40]	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{243}$ scruple
[*π*]*ρ*[*ι*]*μιπίλου*	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{1660}$ scruple
ἀμμωνιακῆς	" " " " "	$\frac{1}{4100}$ scruple
ναῦλον Κλήμεντος	" " " " "	7500 denarii
?[*βοῶ*]*ν καὶ ὄ*<*ν*>*ων*	" " " " "	5000 denarii

These last items are very small.

From some considerations on the *aurum burdonis* and the *primipili*, I suppose that P. Oxy. 1905 belongs to approximately 370.[41] All the taxes of P. Oxy. 1905 belong to the *largitionalia*

[39] Two very instructive series of documents illustrate the prosperous life of soldiers in Elephantine and the oppressed life of peasants of the village of Aphrodito; the former may be found in P. Lond. V and P. Mon., the latter in P. Cairo Maspero I–III. See Rostovtzeff, *Soc. and econ. history*, p. 630.

[40] The meaning of *θαλαττίων* is uncertain.

[41] P. Lips. 87, a receipt for *χρυσὸς βουρδόνων καὶ πριμιπίλου* from the end of the

except the *ναῦλα θαλαττίων*, which would belong to the class of *ἐμβολή* with *ναῦλα* and *τρόφιμον* of Alexandria. We do not know whether the assessment of the *aruratione*s was made separately from the different offices of the Byzantine administration.[42] The contributions of the land tax for the *vestis militaris* are:[43] from each 243 aruras a *χλαμύς*, from each 175 aruras a *στιχάριον*, and from each 1945 aruras a *πάλλιον*. Each *χλαμύς* (l. 6) is reckoned as $^{11}/_{12}$ of a *στιχάριον*.[44] In the early Byzantine period the *vestis militaris* was supplied partly by handicraftsmen [45] scattered in the villages and partly by the Imperial factories.[46]

IV Century, probably after 370 (see other texts of the same period). The receipt for the *πριμίπιλον* = 7/8 scruples. According to the proportion of P. Oxy. 1905, the *χρυσὸς βουρδ.* had to be sol. $\frac{7}{32 \times 8\frac{36}{37}}$, equal to about $^7/_{288}$ or $^1/_{41}$ sol. The amount in P. Lips. 87 seems $^1/_{48} + {}^1/_{192} = {}^5/_{192} = 1/38\frac{2}{5}$, corresponding nearly exactly. Very probably P. Oxy. 1905 and P. Lips. 87 are of the same year because it is not probable that the ratio between the *aurum burdonis* and the *aurum primipili* remained constant throughout a long period. Figures in denarii in P Oxy. 1905 indicate a date perhaps still earlier. In P Oxy. 2001, 3 (466) 400 myriads of denarii are paid for *aurum burdonis*, *primipili* and *tironis*. As for the *chrysargyron*, debased money was accepted instead of gold.

[42] For the *vestis militaris* and the *aurum tironicum* see p. 418 ff. In the Edict Just. XIII of the year 538 three great divisions of taxes were recognized (see Gelzer, *Studien zur Byz. Verwaltung*, 1903, p. 37 ff.). (1) *ἐμβολή* with *ναῦλα* and *τρόφιμον* of Alexandria. (2) *εἴσπραξις τῶν δημοσίων φόρων*. These *φόροι* went to the cash of the *praefectus praetorio*. In the time of Justinian there were two funds, the *γενική* and the *ἰδική*. These taxes are called *arcarica* (Nov. Major. II, 1 [458] and VII, 16 [485]). The *annona militaris* was paid to the *arca* of the *praefectus praetorio*, after Constantine (Zosim. II, 33, 4) until the time of Zosimus (about 500 A.D.). See also the provisions of C. Th. VII, 4, "de erogatione militaris annonae." The *annona militaris* refers not only to the *militia armata* but also to the *cohortalis* and *palatina* (Th. VII, 4, 19). (3) *largitionalia*, to which belonged all the taxes which went to the *sacrae largitiones*, actually all the taxation which did not belong to the *embola* and to the *annona militaris* (C. Th. VII, 6, 2, [368]). The *canon vestium* went to the *largitiones* also when it was adaerated (VII, 6, 5, 432) as most of the taxes in money, when they did not refer to the *annona*, adaerated. The banks of the *largitiones* were the *θησαυροί*.

[43] The *vestis militaris* must be deposited in the thesauri of the *praepositus largitionis* (Th. VIII, 5, 48, 386).

[44] I think that this is the correct interpretation of 1. 6.

[45] P. Oxy. 1448 (318) payment of *στιχάρια* and pallia by villages, cp. P. Oxy. 1424 and 1425, both about 318, P. Lond. 1259 III, p. 239 (IV cent.) with payment in fractions of *χλαμύδες*.

[46] See Persson, *Staat und Manufaktur*, 1923, p. 99 ff., which quotes the Imperial factories of C. Th. VII, 65 = C. Just. XII, 39, 4 (423); C. Th. VII, 6, 4 = C. Just. XII, 39, 3 (396) and C. Th. X, 20, 6 (372).

I consider as basic texts for the *vestis militaris* P. Oxy. 1905 and a group of P. Lips. which, I think, enable us to reconstruct the method of the delivery of the *vestis militaris*. The *epimeletes* of the *vestis militaris*, e.g., a βουλευτής of a town, Panopolis in Papyri Lips., received an order with ἐντάγιον for a certain amount of *vestis militaris* through the *delegatio* of the *praeses*, which he had to supply through the διαδότης. This *vestis militaris* was delivered indirectly to Alexandria, for example, by the *diadotes*. The *epimeletes* with his *entagion* distributed the work among the clothiers. I think that all the transactions between the *epimeletes* and the clothiers resulted from the ἐντάγιον. According to PP. Lips. this ἐντάγιον, which certified that the work was accomplished, was exhibited by the *epimeletes* to the competent office of the *Praeses* of the province, in this case the officialis of the τάξις of the *Praeses Thebaidos*. The ἐντάγιον seems to have entitled the *epimeletes* to reimbursement for the expense assigned to his town for the *vestis militaris*. Probably he gave the ἐντάγιον, on which all transactions with the clothiers were recorded, to the *officialis*, and subsequently an order of payment in his behalf was issued by him. The *epimeletes* was probably paid in this case by cash from the *largitionalia*.[47] I assume that the *vestis militaris* was assessed in gold as an *aruratio*; the gold collected from the aruras was used to buy the *vestes*.[48]

P. Lips. 34 (ca. 375 A.D.) and P. Lips. 35 (373) show a more complicated method of managing the *vestis militaris*. Ammonas, ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν διαψηφίσεων of the *praeses* of the Thebais,[49] gives to Fl. Isidoros, *officialis* of the *taxis* of the *Praeses* of the Thebais, 238 *solidi* according to P. Lips. 34, 138 *solidi* according to P. Lips. 35. The money was handed over to Dioscorides, βουλευτὴς

[47] For the delivery procedure of the *vestis militaris*, see P. Lips. 58 (371), P. Lips. 59 (371) and P Lips. 45, 46 and 60, with very accurate introductions and commentaries by Mitteis and Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 362. Mitteis as well as Wilcken supposed that the *vestis militaris* was a contribution levied in kind, while on the contrary it seems to have been assessed with a *jugatio*, and that therefore the *iuga*, in Egypt the aruras, as a rule paid their contribution in money. Mitteis and Wilcken did not realize the last step of the transaction, *i.e.*, the payment through the *largitionalia* on behalf of the *epimeletai* who as *curiales* took the responsibility for the supply of the *vestis*.

[48] P. Oxy. 1136 shows that the *adaeratio* was probably no more than permissive.

[49] According to Gelzer, *Archiv f. Papyrusf.*, V (1913), p. 351, *scrinarius*, Joh. Lydus, II, 68. Rouillard[2], p. 94.

ἀποδέκτης χρ. τ. of Hermoupolis in P. Lips. 34, πρόπομπος τιρώνων in P. Lips. 35, belonging to the θεῖος κομιτᾶτος. Dioscorides received from Isidoros 61 *solidi* for the *vestis militaris* of the *tirones* — probably for six *vestes militares* because, according to a recent benevolent constitution, the tirones received only 10 *solidi* for their vestis.[50]

The remaining money, 238 −61 or 138 −61 *solidi*, remained in the hands of Fl. Isidoros, who was not anxious to give it back. Later it was stolen, according to both P. Lips. 34 and 35. P. Lips. 35, 1. 10, says that the money which remained in the hands of Fl. Isidoros was to be returned to the people who gave it to him — I suppose to the office of Ammonas, while Mitteis (P. Lips. p. 174) thinks to the taxpayer, an impossible interpretation, in my opinion. The *vestis militaris* and the *aurum tironicum*, once exacted, remained part of the government funds, if it was not used for recruitment. I think that here the ὑποδέκται received the money from the funds of the *praeses*, through some particular manipulation, in order to supply the *tirones* with their *vestes*.

It would be interesting to have an accurate statement of the value of the *vestis militaris*. Our data are incomplete. The troops of Illyricum bought *chlamydes* at ⅔ solidus before 396 and at one solidus later (C J. XII, 38, 3). Prices of *chlamydes* and *sticharia* are to be found in Tenney Frank, *Economic Survey*, V, p. 369 ff. In Diocletian's Edict, "περὶ ἐσθῆτος" XIX, I a, a soldier's mantle (χλαμύς) as in the *indictio*, of the best quality, cost 4000 *denarii*; 2, a shirt (στίχη), as in the *indictio*, 2000 *denarii*; 3, unmarked, 1250 *denarii*. In XXVI, 28 shirts (στίχαι) for soldiers cost 1500 *denarii* for first quality, 1250 for second quality, and 1000 for third quality. The prices of linen shirts for soldiers, according to Diocletian's Edict, XXVI, 28 ff., would be about 2, 1¾, and 1½ *solidi*, which suggests that prices in gold at the end of the fourth

[50] The new constitution, P. Lips. 35, l. 8 ff., θεῖα καὶ φιλάνθρωπος, disposed that the tirones received only 10 solidi for their *vestis*, cp. περὶ τοῦ δεῖν δέκα μόνους χρυσίνους παρασχεῖν τοῖς νεο̣λ[έ]κ̣[τ]οις with P. Lips. 34, V, l. 8, where the 61 solidi were given λόγῳ ἐνδυμάτων τιρόνων. From the two texts it is apparent that the tirones received less under the new constitution. But are we confronted with the ordinary recruits of the protostasia, who received 30 solidi and *vestis* and *sumptus*, or with a different sort of recruits who received vestes and money with another system of recruitment, e.g., the system of the prototypia (see p. 426)? The payment of 10 solidi for the vestis is very high compared with the 6 solidi for vestis and sumptus of C. Th. VII, 13, 7, 2 (375).

century were about half as much (see *Byzantion*, 1941, p. 259 ff.).

If we reckon on the basis of P. Oxy. 1905, comparing a *chlamys* in Egypt costing $^{11}/_{12}$ of a στιχάριον λεινοῦν with the price of a *chlamys* at $^{2}/_{3}$ of a solidus, the contribution of Egypt for the *vestis* (including only χλαμύδες and στιχάρια) would be about 45,000 to 65,000 *solidi*. The prices of the *pallia* seem to have been much higher than the στιχάρια.[51] The contribution of Egypt for the *vestis militaris* at the end of the fourth century can be fixed at about 80,000 *solidi*. In Th. VII, 6 (377) "per Aegyptum in triginta terrenis iugis annua vestis dependatur," *vestis* means a unity represented by the formula $A(\frac{1}{243}$ χλαμύς $+ \frac{1}{125}$ στιχάριον $+ \frac{1}{1945}$ πάλλιον) in which A means the number of aruras contained in 30 iuga. With a iugum of about 16 aruras (see the forthcoming Essay II) and 30 iuga amounting to about 480 aruras, a *vestis* would correspond to about five *chlamydes*, 6 στιχάρια and $\frac{1}{2}$ *pallion*, and A equals approximately 1000. The arable land of Egypt would correspond to about 400,000 iuga (see p. 397) and each thirty iuga would be assessed with about twelve solidi for the *militaris vestis*.

V. The Aurum Tironicum

A great part of the early Byzantine army was levied from the peasantry of the provinces, which also contributed to the Imperial army with tirones or their substitute, the *aurum tironicum*.

In the time of the Empire the provinces contributed to the Imperial army with their *tirones voluntarii* and with the *tirones facti ex paganis*. The provinces supplied recruits as in the Byzantine period, as appears from P. Lond. II, 342, p. 173–174 (185 or 216–17 A.D.) where Sempronius, an elder of the village, hunted for recruits "τειρῶνας κυνηγῆσαι ὕστερον ἀργυρισθεῖς ἀπέλυσεν

[51] Evidence on the prices of *pallia* is very scarce. In Wessely, *Pal. St.* XXII, 46 (II Cent. A.D.), a *pallium* is valued at 20 drachmas (Johnson, *Econ. Survey*, II, p. 319). *Pallia*, however, seem to be much more expensive than στιχάρια in the list collected in Heichelheim, *Ec. Survey*, IV, p. 186 f. A white pallium costs 100 denarii in Dura Pg 74 (232 A.D.), a pallium 90 denarii in Dura S. E. G. VII, 240 (235–40 A.D.), while a στιχάριον costs 10 denarii in S. E. G. VII, 247 Dura. All the prices of Dura of the year 240 and thereabouts are much higher than the Egyptian prices of about the same period. We do not know the price of cereals for Dura, but we have the impression that the level of the prices of Dura is more comparable with the prices of Ephesus in the I–II cent. A.D. (see A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV [1940–41], 270) than with the Egyptian prices.

αὐτούς" in order to earn a ransom for their freedom.[52] Doubtless the provinces had to supply a certain number of soldiers. And very probably wealthy people contributed to encourage the young volunteers. Probably the *aurum tironicum* in the Byzantine period developed out of this contribution. The *aurum tironicum*, assessed with an aruratio, was exacted by the curiae of the towns through the ὑποδέκται and delivered to the provincial treasury,[53] where it was used to pay the recruits supplied by the curiae of the towns.[54] The *vestis militaris*, the *aurum tironicum* and the other taxes of P. Oxy. 1905 were assessed in gold as *aruratione*s. Another evidence of an aruratio in gold collected by the ὑποδέκτης is supplied by P. Lips. 62, Col. II, l. 17 ff.[55] But while in Egypt we are con-

[52] See Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 395, and for the character of the recruitment of the Egyptian Army, Lesquier, p. 224 ff. The recruitment of the army confronted the Roman empire with great difficulties under the first emperors. Tacitus says of Tiberius, "dilectibus supplendus exercitus: nam voluntarium militem deesse, ac si suppeditet, non eadem virtute ac modestia agere, quia plerumque inopes ac vagi militiam sumant." In the time of Trajan draftees could give substitutes, Plin , *Ep.*, X 39. In the levies extortions were often used: Tac., *Ann.*, XIV, 18, *Hist.*, IV, 14, *Agricola*, cap. 7 quoted by A. Delbrueck *op. cit.*, p. 197.

[53] The *aurum tironicum* in P. Lips. 62 (384–385 A.D.) assessed as an aruratio (P. Oxy. 1905) was exacted by the βουλευτής of Hermoupolis, Aurelius Philammon, who was an ὑποδέκτης of the *aurum tironicum*. The sum was levied according to the *delegatio* of the *praeses* of the province and paid by the ὑποδέκτης to the χρυσώνης, *monetarius* (Just. Ed. XI, c. 2), the chief financial administrator of the province (Thebais). The money exacted was used by the treasury of the *monetarius* for the engagement of the *tirones*. In P. Lips. 61, Antinoupolis (375 A.D.), the *monetarius* of the Thebais declares to Flavius Isidoros, *officialis* for the *taxis* of the *praeses Thebaidos*, that he paid 72 *solidi* ὑπὲρ ὀνόματος of Hermoupolis εἰς λόγον χρ. τιρ. τῶν παλαιῶν χρόνων. See also P. Oxy. 1103 (360 A.D.), introduction.

[54] The *aurum tironicum* was collected by the ὑποδέκτης Aurelius Philammon, in P. Lips., 62 (384–5 A.D.) and paid to the χρυσώνης of the province (Thebais). The payment made by the ὑποδέκτης to the χρυσώνης according to the orders of the *praeses* was made ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτείας of the ὑποδέκτης. The payments for the arrears of the 6th–9th indiction were in four receipts, as follows: 30 pounds of gold, 20 pounds of gold, 15 pounds 6 ounces of gold, and 18 pounds of gold. We do not know the aruratio of the nomos of Hermoupolis, hut if the nomos of Hermoupolis had to be about one-thirtieth of the arable land of Egypt (see A. Segrè, *J. E. A.*, 1941, p. 177) the *nomos*, according to the *aruratio* of $\frac{1}{20}\frac{2}{3}$ scruple each arura, had to pay about 40 pounds of gold a year.

[55] In P. Lips. 62 (384–5 A.D.) col. II, line 10, Chonis, χρυσώνης, acknowledges to Philammon, ὑποδέκτης χρυσοῦ of Hermoupolis, that he received 38 pounds 3 oz. gold: line 13: διαφόρων τίτλων χωρὶς διαστολῶν ἀκύρων οὐσῶν ἑτέρων ἐνταγίων ἀπὸ ἰνδικ(τίονος) ιγ καὶ ἀπὸ ιδ ἰνδικ(τίονος) καὶ λοιπάδων ἀπ(ε)στάλησαν εἰς τοὺς θείους θησαυροὺς Ἀθὺρ η πεντεκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικ(τίονος) εἴδε ἐν σταθμῷ εἴδε ἐν νομισματίοις. In P. Lips. 62, col. II, line 17 ff. the same Philammon pays to the χρυσώνης 10 pounds of gold for the 12th indiction, ἀπὸ λόγου χρυσοῦ ἀρουρατίονος

fronted with a *capitatio terrena* for the *aurum tironicum*, in other regions the *aurum tironicum* appears to have been paid as an alternative to supplying an acceptable recruit, among people who were not *coloni* or attached to compulsory trades, Th. VII, 13, 13, 397: Arcadius and Honorius "damus optionem ut, quod conducibile senatus videtur eligendi habeat potestatem, id est aut tirones aptos officiis militaribus praestiterit, aut pro singulis XXV solidos numerent post initam videlicet sumptuum rationem et vestium et pastus."

In the year 375 (Cod. Th. VII, 13, 7, 2) a *senator honoratus*, a *principalis decurio vel plebeius* had to present a recruit "suo ac sociorum nomine ex agro ac domo propria," and therefore had to pay 36 solidi, 30 to the administration and 6 to the recruit for the *vestis* and *sumptus*.[56]

The *vestis militaris* belonged, I think, to the *anabolicae species*. Ἀναβολικόν did not mean "good for export overseas," as it was understood first by Rostovtzeff, who later (*Soc. and Econ. Hist. of the Roman Emp.*, p. 611) connected ἀναβολικόν with ἀναβάλλειν, "to deal out (a portion of a certain kind of goods for export to Rome)." More probably, ἀναβολικόν is related originally to ἀναβάλλειν, *induere*, and ἀναβολικόν with *indumentum vestis* (cf. Liddell-Scott, s.v.). The *annona* referred to the food, the ἀναβολικόν to the *vestis*. The ἀναβολικόν later included commodities which do not have much to do with the *vestis*.[56a]

VI. How Much of the Gold Levied for the Aurum Tironicum and the Vestis Militaris was Actually Used for Military Purposes?

There were approximately seven million aruras in Egypt, each of which was assessed 1/83 *solidus* for the *aurum tironicum*. On this basis Egypt contributed about 90,000 *solidi* for the *aurum*

διγραμμ. . . . The responsibility for collecting the *aruratio* in gold was laid upon the ὑποδέκται. I do not know what the διγραμμ . . . of the *aruratio* may be, but I doubt that it meant half a solidus for each arura, which would he too high a rate of taxation.

[56] The *aurum tironicum* was reckoned at 30 sol. in Africa, Sicilia, Sardinia and Corsica in the year 410 (Th. VII, 13, 20, and Nov. Val. 6, 3, 1 (444). See Kubitschek Pauly-Wissowa, s.v., vol. II, p. 2553 and Grosse, p. 213 ff.

[56a] We deal with the *anabolicae species* in a later Essay on Byzantine Economy, under the chapter χειρωνάξιον.

tironicum.[57] Each *tiro* corresponded to about 30 *solidi*. Therefore, if the *aurum tironicum* corresponded to the number of *tirones* which had to be presented, Egypt gave 3000 *tirones* each year. Since a *tiro* entered the army at eighteen (see Grosse, p. 107) and served twenty-five years before receiving the *missio*, and since the average term of service was not more than fifteen years because of the proportion of those who died or became *inutiles* between eighteen and forty-three years of age, the Egyptian contingent must have numbered about 45,000.[58] This is the minimum figure.[59]

Now, each *tiro* received 30 *solidi*. If we reckon that each thousand aruras, for example, had to supply a *tiro* or pay 30 *solidi*, we may suppose that about 3500 out of the 7000 capitula of 1000 aruras each, that is to say half of Egypt, paid 30 *solidi*, while the other 50 per cent presented actual *tirones*. In that case Egypt supplied 1500 actual *tirones* who received 30 *solidi* each. If the Byzantine Empire paid the price for the actual number of its recruits the number of the *tirones* corresponded to half the number of iuga divided by the number of iuga which had to supply a *tiro*. Therefore each province, theoretically at least, presented actual *tirones* from half its territory, and money for their maintenance from the other half. It is known that there were provinces which supplied actual *tirones* for the most part, and others which paid the *aurum tironicum*.[60] Egypt probably belonged to the second category.[61]

But we do not think that the administration used for the enlist-

[57] This figure is not very accurate because we assume that all the Egyptian landed proprietors contributed equally according to their number of aruras, as it appears from P. Oxy. 1905. We do not know anything about exemptions. And the figures would be still higher if we consider that the *aurum tironicum* might have been paid not only with the jugatio but with the capitatio (personal tax) as it appears from Amm., XXI, 66, where "Omnis ordo et professio" contributes to the *aurum tironicum*.

[58] Grosse, p. 201, reckons that an army of 300,000 men needed 20,000 recruits yearly.

[59] For the recruitment of the *tirones* see Grosse, p. 107.

[60] See Grosse, p. 211. Thraciae, for example, supplied *tirones* for the most part, while the *provinciae suburbicariae* supplied money.

[61] Not all the *tirones* were enlisted with the payment of the *aurum tironicum;* therefore these figures may be used only for a very rough calculation. Moreover, we do not know whether the *Fundi patrimoniales* of the Emperor paid the *aurum tironicum*.

ments the whole of the *aurum tironicum* which had been collected from half the country.[62] It may be that during a certain period A *tirones* were presented by the *possessores* with B *tirones adaerati*, being a larger figure than A. In that case the administration easily converted a part of B into actual recruits. The government could also ask for *tirones* or their equivalent according to the need.

Some considerations may show that a great part of the money levied as *aurum tironicum*, which must have amounted to about half a million solidi at least for the whole Byzantine Empire at the end of the fourth century, was used also for other military expenses.

VII. The Recruitment of the Byzantine Army

Starting from these considerations we shall try to clear up some points concerning the manner in which soldiers were recruited in the Byzantine period.

There were two recruiting systems, the *prototypia* and the *protostasia*.[63] For the recruiting of *tirones*, the whole country, as we know, was divided into *capitula* of, let us say, 30 juga. Each *capitulum*, which had to supply a *tiro* or the equivalent in money, had a president, the *capitularius* or *temonarius*.[64] The *capitularius* was responsible for the *aurum tironicum* of his *capitulum*. This system of recruiting, called the *protostasia*, which was considered as a *munus patrimonii* because imposed on iuga and capita, was in use before the year 293.[65] Under the other system, the *prototypia* (see the first case in Th. VI, 35, 3 [319 or 352], Grosse, p. 213) the *capitularius* had to find the recruits and exact the money from the *capitula* afterwards.[66] The *decuriones* and *senatores* were obliged to serve the *prototypia*, which was rather a *munus personale* than a *munus patrimonii*, until the year 362 (Th. XI, 23, 2). Grosse thinks that in this system the sum paid to the *tiro* was not fixed

[62] If we put the army of Egypt in the Byzantine period at between ten and fifteen thousand soldiers, the number of recruits required yearly would be between 650 and 1000. Only a small amount — probably a third or a quarter — of the *aurum tironicum* was used for the *tirones*. The rest was probably badly needed for the maintenance of the army.

[63] See Grosse, p. 212 ff.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 212 f.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 211, n. 1.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

but arrived at by bargaining, and that the system gave occasion to great frauds (Th. VII, 13, 7 [375]). In my opinion we have not a very clear idea of the *prototypia*, and the *protostasia* also presents some problems to be solved.[67] The papyri supply some data for the *protostasia* but very little for the *prototypia*, so far as I know. They do show new aspects of recruiting problems in the Byzantine army. In Egypt, at any rate, the *aurum tironicum* was probably exacted as an *aruratio* directly from the landowners, who paid it to the fiscus through the ὑποδέκται according to the numbers of their aruras. This money, or more properly a fraction of it, was put at the disposal of the curiae, which recruited the *tirones*. They did this through their ἐπιμεληταί of the *aurum tironicum* in their territory, paying the *aurum tironicum* fixed by the government and an extra sum for the equipment of the recruits. The ἐπιμεληταί of the *aurum tironicum* acted exactly as the ἐπιμεληταί of the *annona*.[68] It must be emphasized that each military district [69] was obliged to pay the *aurum tironicum*, or to present recruits. Later a number of *tirones* proportional to the amount paid in was bought in each district with the *aurum tironicum*.

It seems that the recruiting of the *tirones* was not an easy task. As Th. VII, 2, 3 (380)[70] shows, the *tirones* were classified as coming from three groups of people: *vagi*, *veteranorum filii*,[71] and

[67] For all this see O. Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *capitulum*.

[68] P. Oxy. VIII 1103 and P. Lond. III, p. 228–9. This procedure is shown in many other papyri. In P. Oxy. VIII 1103 (360 A.D., = Wilcken, *Chrest.*, n. 465), Eutrygios, an ex-curator, explains in a meeting of the city council of Oxyrhynchos that he made clear to the dux that the recruits applied wrongly to him "ὡς μὴ πληρωθέντων τοῦ συμφώνου τοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς." The town gave them not only the sum (30 sol.) which was decreed by the government from the ταμιεῖον (the fiscus) but also a διάπεισμα, an extra. (See P. Tebt. II, 34, 27–29, and Wilcken, *Chrest.*, p. 551). In P. Lond. II, p. 228–9 (Wilcken, *Chrest.*, n. 466, fourth century, Heracleopolites) Wilcken understands that the village Τώου, instead of presenting a recruit, preferred to pay a sum, usually 30 solidi, to the fiscus (ταμιακὸς λόγος), but that actually the village gave the money to Kyrillos, the epimeletes of the *aurum tironicum*, and that Kyrillos, for this money, recruited a tiro from Τώου, Papnuthis.

[69] I say military district because we do not know if there were military circumscriptions for the levy of the *tirones*. I think that the *capitularii* also, where the system of the capitula was used, had to pay the *aurum tironicum* first and then purchase the amount of recruits needed.

[70] Grosse, p. 204 ff.

[71] Th. VII, 1, 8 (365) and Th. VII, 1, 10 (367). The sons of soldiers probably did not receive the *aurum tironicum*.

vacantes. Military service was ruled by the principle of corporative organization. Military service became a profession, like that of the *navicularii*, the *pistores*, etc. But outside of this corporative pattern the Empire recruited a large part of its army from barbarian populations. Grosse [72] emphasizes the recruitment of the Roman army from what he calls the deditician *Quasigemeinde*. As we know, in some cases *barbari* of the borders under their respective rulers either served as allies or as recruits. There are a few cases in Ammianus (XVII, 13, 3; XIX, 11, 6–7; XXX, 6, 1; XXXI, 4, 4)[73] of *gentes foederatae* who pledge themselves to give recruits to the Roman army. The *laeti* and *gentiles* were barbarians (Germans) settled in military colonies, chiefly in Gaul, but also in Italy. They became very numerous in the third century A.D. The *laeti*, who were Germans of the free Germany on the other side of the Rhine, were doubtless granted Roman citizenship when they settled in the territory of the Roman Empire, according to the principles of the *Constitutio Antoniniana*.[74]

[72] Grosse, p. 206. [73] Grosse, p. 207.

[74] According to the C. A., *laeti* and *gentiles*, who lived in the Roman Empire as Roman citizens, keeping their own organization, were not dediticii. See A. Segrè, *Rend. Acc. Vat.*, XVI (1940), 189 ff.

For the infiltration of barbari into the Roman Empire in the time of Caracalla, see Bikerman, *Das Edict des Kaisers Caracall* (1926), p. 7 ff. Bikerman understands that in P. Giss., 40, I, line 6, ὀσ]άκις ἐὰν ὑ[π]εισέλ[θωσ]ιν εἰς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀνθρώπους refers to *barbari* infiltrating into the Empire, while Heichelheim, JEA, 1941, p. 12, translates "if I lead (as Romans as many myriads) as happen to be my subjects to the temples of the gods," where ὑ[π]εισέλ[θωσ]ιν is translated "as happen to be" and in line 6, μυρίους is read instead of ξένους. Although the interpretation of Bikerman presents many difficulties, e.g., the interpretation of P. Giss. 40, I as a novella, which appears not acceptable, the restoration in Heichelheim, *ibid.*, p. 15, and his interpretation are ingenious but not convincing. Bickerman raised the question of the *status civitatis* of the *barbari* who might enter into the territory of the Roman Empire as refugees, or by invitation of the Emperors (p. 10) and might have had the political position of *foederati* or *gentes* (p. 12) and concluded, doubtless, rightly, that these *barbari* (p. 24) were not *barbari dediticii*, but *tributarii*, *cultores*, *coloni*, *laeti*, and that they became Roman citizens (p. 13).

Heichelheim's interpretation of the C. A., l. 7 f., "I grant, therefore, to all (free persons throughout the Roman) world the citizenship of the Romans (no other legal status remaining) except that of the dediticians," is not convincing. (See A. Segrè, *Rend. Acc. Pont.*, XVI [1940], 193 ff.). *Barbari dediticii* (see Grosse, p. 203 and Bikerman, p. 24) could also serve in the Roman army, as in a few cases slaves did (see Th. VII, 13, 16, 17 (406)). The conclusions of Grosse (p. 200) on the free Germans who were not Roman *cives* in the Roman Army are mostly inaccurate, because Grosse, in 1920, followed the traditional interpretation of the Constitutio Antoniniana given by Mommsen.

Formally [75] the principle of conscription existed until the beginning of the fifth century, but Nov. Val. V. No. 2 (440) shows that in that period *Romani cives* and members of guilds were exempted from the army service. According to Grosse,[76] most of the recruits were volunteers, attracted by the initial payment of the *aurum tironicum*, by the agreeable nature of the military life, and by the many fiscal advantages and exemptions which a soldier received.

VIII. Roman Military Expenses in Egypt in the First and Second Centuries

There are no figures extant for the total expenses of the Roman army in Egypt in the Byzantine period, but, using the data of the *stipendia* during the Empire and the *annonae* in the period after Diocletian, we may collect some figures which will tell us how the expenses expanded and declined in different periods.

The most important data for the first and second centuries of our era have been collected and elaborated by Lesquier in *L'Armée Romaine*, p. 260 ff., and later by Johnson in his *Economic Survey*, II, 620 ff.

Lesquier (p. 112) calculates the strength of troops in Roman Egypt during the first and second centuries as follows:

83 A.D.

	infantry	cavalry
2 legions	5480 x 2: 10960	120 x 2: 240
3 alae		500 x 3: 1500
4 cohortes equitatae	380 x 4: 1520	120 x 4: 480
4 cohortes	500 x 4: 2000	
Total	14480	2220
Total infantry and cavalry		16700

144–147 A.D.

	infantry	cavalry
1 legion	5480	120
4 alae		500 x 4: 2000
4 cohortes equitatae	380 x 4: 1520	120 x 4: 480
cohors 1 Ulpia Afr. eq.	760	240
cohors scutata civ. R.	500	
Total	8260	2840
Total infantry and cavalry		11100

[75] Grosse, p. 202.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 202.

The estimation of the wages paid to the army of occupation is left largely to conjecture.[77]

First century to circa A.D. 81: 2 legions and 10 cohorts of auxiliaries:

11200 legionaries @ 744 dr.	8,332,800 dr.
5500 auxiliaries @ circa 545 dr.	2,997,500 dr.
Total	11,330,300 dr.
From A.D. 83 to circa A.D. 150:	
11200 legionaries @ 891 dr.	9,979,200 dr.
5500 auxiliaries @ circa 654 dr.	3,597,000 dr.
Total	13,576,200 dr.
From circa A.D. 150 to circa A.D. 200	
5600 legionaries @ 891 dr.	4,989,600 dr.
5500 auxiliaries @ circa 654 dr.	3,597,000 dr.
Total	8,586,600 dr.

Severus and Caracalla increased the *stipendia* of the soldiers, but Egyptian evidence of the third century A.D. suggests that, in order to keep the purchasing power of the *stipendia* unchanged, they had to be doubled in the time of Severus.[78] No estimate is available for the pay of higher officers.[79] The cost of maintaining the fleet and yards on the Red Sea is also unknown.[80] There is no evidence that the grain fleet (*classis Alexandrina*) was convoyed, although at times such a precaution was probably necessary.[81]

These data would lead us to reckon the part of the military expenses represented by the pay of the Imperial army in Egypt during the period about 83 A.D. at ca. 25 million drachmas yearly; in the period about 150 A.D., at ca. 17 million drachmas.

But with the Severi the expenses for the army, counted in drachmas or denarii, were higher, owing to the inflation and the increased size of the army. The last figure of 17 million drach-

[77] Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 672, uses the data of Lesquier, p. 260, but with some corrections. He reckons the pay of the auxiliary at five-sixths the pay of a legionary, on the evidence of P. Gen. Lat. I (Johnson, n. 407 (81–83 A.D.?)).

[78] According to Alföldi, C. A. H. XII, 221 ff., soldiers at the end of the third century were rewarded mostly with *largitiones* and *annonae*. For the *largitiones* gold medallions were used as presents accompanying the Imperial festivals, or as bribes.

[79] An attempt could be made to calculate the *stipendia* of higher officers using the Byzantine evidence. See Grosse, p. 111 ff.

[80] Expenses for the horses and beasts of burden were far from being negligible.

[81] Johnson, *ibid.*, p. 672.

mas may have trebled. About 50 million drachmas were probably spent for the Egyptian army at the time of Caracalla.[82]

IX. Some Figures on the Size of the Imperial and Byzantine Armies

The figures on the size of the Imperial and Byzantine armies are not fully reliable. Often most of the effectives indicated in the source existed only on paper.

Starting with the fact that the Roman army, at the beginning of the third century, was composed of thirty-three legions, Grosse (*op. cit.*, p. 253), in agreement with Marquardt, *Röm. Staats.*, II², 241, puts the whole army with the *auxilia* at 300,000 soldiers. According to Zosimus (II, 15, 1), the army of Constantine in Gaul was about 100,000 men, which means, says Grosse (p. 253), that the Roman army was about 400,000 strong at this time. But Lydus (*De Mens.* I, 27) gives for the army of Diocletian 390,000 soldiers and 45,000 sailors, saying that these figures had been doubled by the time of Constantine. Grosse, quite rightly, does not believe Lydus.[83]

Later the Byzantine army was greatly reduced. Agathias[84] says that under Justinian the army was reduced to 150,000 soldiers, while in the time of the undivided monarchy there had been 650,000. This larger figure, also, does not seem reliable. Grosse estimates, on the basis of the *Notitia dignitatum* of the beginning of the fifth century, an army of 194,500 men. He estimates that there were 94 legions with 1000 soldiers each and 108 *auxilia* of 500 soldiers each, making a total of 148,000 men. Then there were 81 *vexillationes* and 12 *scholae* with 46,500 cavalry.

Some calculations of Seeck, according to Grosse, p. 253, would bring the army of the time of Diocletian close to 500,000 men. This figure is generally accepted, but it is not based on reliable

[82] We realize that these calculations are highly conjectural, but I think it better to have a very rough idea of the figures than none at all.

[83] The figures of the army of the IV cent. are discussed by Delbrueck, *op. cit.*, II, 226 ff. Mommsen from the *notitia dignitatum* assumes that the army of Diocletian was of about 500–600 thousand soldiers ("Das römische Heerwesen seit Diocletian," *Hermes*, XXIV, 257), but many of the units of this big army existed only on paper. We do not know exactly how large the units were and whether the *limitanei* were reckoned as soldiers.

[84] *Hist. Min. Graeci*, II, Dindorf (Leipzig, 1871), V, 13.

data. Delbrück (*Geschichte d. Kriegskunst*, II, 216 ff., 311 ff.) doubts even that the army in Constantine's time was bigger than in the time of Septimius Severus. If we assume that Egypt in the age of Diocletian had an army of six legions, with *vexillationes* and *scholae* in the same proportion as found in the *notitia dignitatum*, the Egyptian army of the time of Diocletian could have been about 13,000 men, or 6000 legionaries, 3500 auxilia and 3500 knights.[85] This figure would be near that of the second century A.D. The army of Constantine was bigger than that of Diocletian, but hardly the double.

In Egypt the army at the time of Diocletian was of about the same size as the Egyptian army of the second century, as is shown by the evidence of Egyptian papyri. It is therefore very difficult to admit that in the whole Empire the army of Diocletian could have been much greater than that of the Severi. The assertion of Lactantius, *De mort. pers.*, VII, 5, that Diocletian increased the army to four times its previous size appears therefore to be hardly credible.[86]

Although we know how uncertain the figures are, we would

[85] As we now know, the period of Diocletian was revolutionary in the reorganization of the Army which took place at that time. This reorganization (P. W. XII, p. 1348 ff. Ritterling s.v. *legio*) strengthened chiefly the defense of the borders. Each border province had two legions and the same pattern of formation of even elements was followed with the *auxilia*. Egypt (see p. 1355 f.) was divided into three provinces, Jovia, Herculia and Thebais, and had two legions in each province, but the stations of the legions may have been altered with the change in the administrative divisions of Egypt after Diocletian. Stein (*op. cit.*, p. 107) puts the army of Diocletian at about 60 or 70 legions with auxilia, alae, cohortes and other formations. But many of these legions were old *vexillationes*, and therefore smaller than the average. Stein gives the figure of 500,000 soldiers for the whole Roman army of Diocletian. From 297 A.D. on, the *comitatenses* were preferred, as better troops, to the *limitanei* (A. Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 107). To the *comitatenses* belonged the *vexillationes* (cavalry) and legions of infantry and formations of about five hundred soldiers, probably taken from the old numeri, mostly *barbari* who alone were called auxilia at that date. K. Stade, *op. cit.*, p. 59 f., emphasizes that the strengthening of the borders of the empire with fortifications and with the building of strategic roads followed the patterns of the military policy of the earlier emperors (see Ritterling, legio, P. W. XII, p. 1349, Zosim, II 34, 1 and Fabricius, *Limes*, P. W. XII 571 ff). While Diocletian operated with an army distributed mostly at the boundaries (*limitanei* or *riparienses*) with comparatively few *comitatenses*, Constantine transformed the Roman army into an operational army, i.e., increased comparatively the number of the *comitatenses*.

[86] Probably the assertion of Lactantius originated in the fact that the number of legions was increased to 94, but the legions of Diocletian had only about a thousand men each.

suggest for a tentative estimate of the size of the Roman army in the Imperial and Byzantine periods the following figures:

Severus: not more than 300,000 men, but normally less.
Diocletian: — 400,000 men.
Constantine: 500,000 men.
Fifth century: About 200,000 men.
Justinian: About 150,000 men.

These figures explain the paucity of the expeditionary forces of the Byzantine armies after the fifth century, which has been noticed by Delbrück.[87] But also in the period of Diocletian the distribution of the Roman army in defensive positions along the borders of the Empire implied that military expeditions were undertaken as far as possible with troops garrisoned on the nearest borders (*riparienses* and *limitanei*). The difficulties of transporting troops from remote regions were of a double nature, economic and psychological: economic, because the transportation expenses were very heavy along the routes (Stuart Jones, *A Companion to Roman History*, p. 45, col. I, 5, 6, Pliny, Epist. V, 6, and this essay, p. 405); psychological, because the soldiers who were used to their life in the garrisons were not willing to leave their families to engage in distant expeditions.

I realize that it is very difficult to compare the military expenses of the first two centuries A.D. with those of the early Byzantine period. However, to understand the financial implications of the military organization in the period of Diocletian and of Constantine we have to show how the expenses for the *annona* at the end of the third century A.D. and of the first half of the fourth century, measured in gold, were comparatively much greater than the expenses of the first and second centuries A.D.

We start from the very conjectural data of Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V, 4 ff. According to this author, Augustus had about 25 legions, i.e., 150,000 citizen soldiers. Each drew 225 den. per year: in all ca. 32,000,000 den. To these expenses should be added the *donativa* to the soldiers and the rewards at the completion of twenty or more years of service. The total expenses of the annual military budget of the Augustan age may be calculated between 350 and 400 million HS. Many of the items given by Tenney Frank have to be revised: many of the

[87] Grosse, p. 254.

figures are of course highly conjectural. The item referring to the *auxilia* seems to be very doubtful (see p. 414). Reckoning the total expenses for food of the Roman soldier at about one third of his pay we should conclude that in the Augustan period the expenses for the rations of the army would correspond to about one quarter of the total expenses.

The officers would receive	ca. 7,500,000 den.
Food for allied troops (about 50 *modii* to each) of about 150,000 men at 1 den. per *modius*	ca. 7,500,000 den.
Cost of transport and ordnance	ca. 7,500,000 den.
The navy cost very little after Actium	ca. 5,000,000 den.
	ca. 59,000,000 den.
	= ca. 240,000,000 HS
Cost of praetorian and urban cohorts	
9000 praetorians at 750 den. per year	ca. 6,750,000 den.
3000 urban soldiers at ca. 360 den.	ca. 1,080,000 den.
Officers for these troops	ca. 1,000,000 den.
	ca. 8,830,000 den.
	= ca. 35,000,000 HS

We reckon further that the expenses for food of a Roman army of ca. 300,000 men at the end of the second century A.D. might have corresponded to a little more than a third of the entire wages of the soldiers. The administration did not supply the soldiers with *vestis*, *arma*, etc., but did supply of course extraordinary expenses, like transportation. At the end of the second century A.D. the Roman army might have cost ca. 500 million HS yearly, of which the expenses for food would have been about one quarter of the total expenses and one third of the expenses for wages.

In the early Byzantine period, under Diocletian and under Constantine, the expenses for the army for food were proportionally much higher because the prices of food expressed in gold were much higher.[88] In gold, 500 million sestertii in the time of Severus (reckoning an aureus at ca. 1/50 of a pound) would correspond to ca. 100,000 pounds of gold. In wheat, reckoning a *modius* at one denarius, i.e., nearly double the Egyptian prices of the first and second century A.D.[88a] the expenses for the army would correspond to about 133 million *modii* = 66⅔ million artabas of wheat.

[88] A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV, 259 ff.

[88a] A. Segrè, *Circolazione*, p. 78 ff., *Byzantion*, XV, 259 ff.

X. Military Expenses in the Byzantine Period

It is practically impossible to give figures for the military expenses met by Egypt in the Byzantine period. We do not know how much was spent for each soldier beside the *annona* for *vestis*, *donativa*, for fortifications, for expeditions, horses, non-commissioned officers, officers, etc. We may be sure that about one-third of the army was composed of cavalry, which meant a further expense of *capita*, and in the Justinian period this was not much less than an *annona* (see p. 409). In the time of Diocletian and Constantine also this was very high.[88b] The expenses of the *annona* were, moreover, mounting higher than is apparent from the official prices, because the prices of the *adaeratio* reckoned by the government were much lower than the actual expenses paid by the provincials.

Considering the prices of the *annona* and the expenses for officers, clothes, weapons, etc., a very conservative estimate for the expenses of the army at various times would be as follows:[89]

Diocletian	400,000 x 40 sol.:	16,000,000 sol.
Constantine . .	500,000 x 60 sol.:	30,000,000 sol.
Fifth century:	200,000 x 16 sol.:	3,200,000 sol.
Justinian:	150,000 x 16 sol.:	2,400,000 sol.

The very conservative figure of 16,000,000 *solidi* for the military expenses of the time of Diocletian corresponds to 222,222 pounds of gold with a purchasing power in wheat, according to the Edict, of 128 million *modii* = 38.6 million artabas.

In the age of Constantine, for a bigger army, we assume that the expenses measured in gold were nearly doubled, while the purchasing power of the amount of gold spent was not much higher than in the time of Diocletian.

These figures are very conservative. The prices in gold at the time of the Edict of Diocletian were probably higher than they appear in the *brevis* (see p. 393) and we did not include in our calculations the expenses of the *aurum tironicum* (see p. 422 ff.). Moreover, the fiscal exemptions of the soldiers and of the *veterani*

[88b] In this period (see p. 411) the expense of feeding a horse with barley was exceedingly high.

[89] We have to reckon with the cost of maintaining the military machinery and with the payroll of the different officers and non-commissioned officers (see Grosse, *op. cit.*, p. 111 ff.) who were paid mostly in *annonae* and *capita*.

in the early Byzantine period have wider implications than the exemptions in the first and second centuries A.D. We think therefore that the military expenses of the last years of Diocletian must be reckoned as three times higher than those of the times of the Antonines. Under Constantine we may probably reckon with expenses five times higher. These figures are, of course, highly speculative, but they give an idea of the crushing burdens of military expenses of the early Byzantine period.

What percentage of the total budget of the emperors is represented by these figures? Sundwall (*Weströmische Studien*, p. 150 ff., followed by Grosse, *op. cit.*, p. 208) reckons the revenues of the Western Roman Empire at the beginning of the reign of Honorius at 22 million *solidi*, and 50 years later at 15 million *solidi*.[90] I think that we have an approximate indication of the revenue, in money and kind, of the Byzantine Empire at the time of Justinian in the accounts of the taxes paid by the village of Aphrodito. On this basis the revenues of all Egypt in the second

[90] These figures are probably about twice the correct amount. They would fit the whole Empire — east and west, better. E. Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 509 ff., figures out the budget of the Western Empire on the basis of Nov. Val. III, XIII (445) but his calculations are not accurate. According to E. Stein, the *annonae militares* and the *capita* of the six African provinces amounted to 300,000 solidi. He agrees with Beloch (*Bevölkerung*, p. 50) that the population of the Western Empire was 25 million inhahitants of which six million were in Africa. E. Stein calculates that the *annona* was about half the total taxation and arrives at the figure of about two and a half million solidi for the budget of the Western Roman Empire, a figure which was reduced to about a million and a half about the time of the death of Honorius. The calculations of E. Stein include so many conjectures that they appear very uncertain. Moreover, his results appear very unsatisfactory because it is improbable that Egypt at the time of Justinian could have sustained a taxation of about two and a half million solidi, tbat is, the same amount as the whole Western Empire, and the military expenses of the fifth century would be extraordinary for so poor a budget as then obtained (see p. 435). I think that if the *annonae* of Nov. Val. III, XIII, are *annonae militares* we are not at liberty to suppose that the *annonae* could be more than half of the entire taxation of the African provinces. For Egypt in the time of Justinian we may perhaps reckon an *annona* of about 80,000 to 120,000 solidi, or about 8 solidi apiece for the army of ten to fifteen thousand men. We do not include in this figure the *vestis militaris*, the weapons, etc., which were paid for as *largitionalia* and not as *arcarica*. The *annonae* in Egypt would have been one twentieth of the total budget. If we reckon the *annonae* of the officers of the *militia non armata* of the civil services we should not come to a total expense of more than one tenth of the entire budget with the *annonae*. Therefore I think that the figure of 300,000 solidi given by E. Stein would mean a total of about three million solidi for the revenue of the African provinces in the fifth century, and not a mere 600,000 solidi.

half of the sixth century were about 2.4 million solidi. Egypt must have yielded not less than one sixth of the entire revenue of the Empire; therefore the Imperial revenues at the time of Justinian probably amounted to about 15 million solidi. These figures are obviously highly conjectural, but much less so than the figures of Sundwall and E. Stein.

The expense for an army of 150,000 soldiers in the time of Justinian (see p. 433) may be reckoned at about 2.4 million *solidi*, i.e., at about one sixth of the entire revenue of the Empire. In the time of Diocletian, according to the most conservative calculations, an army of 300,000 men would have cost about 12 million *solidi*; in the time of Constantine an army of 400,000 men about 24 million *solidi*, and in the fifth century an army of 200,000 men 3.2 million *solidi*. Army expenses for the period in which the currency was stabilized appear to range between 15% and 20% of the total revenue, which is a reasonable figure. On the other hand, the expenses for the inflation period seem incredible, and show how the widely accepted figure of 500,000 for Diocletian's army may have been exaggerated. The crushing military expenses of the time of Diocletian and Constantine are due, not so much to an increase of the effectives of the army, as to the inflation due to the terrible scarcity of production of that age. Doubts may be aroused whether the army of Diocletian reached half a million men, but even a moderate army in the pre-Byzantine period had been a very great burden for the Empire. The military expenses were certainly very high in gold as early as the period from Claudius II to Diocletian. The inflation of the second half of the third century shows that the economic conditions of the Empire under Claudius II were not so different from the conditions of the age of Diocletian.

Obviously, to keep up such a military machine and the construction of so many public buildings the entire budget of Diocletian and Constantine had to be nearly 30 and 60 million solidi. (See e.g. Costa, *Dizionario epigrafico di De Ruggiero*, s.v. Diocleziano, p. 1862 ff., and A. Segrè, *J. E. A.*, 1941, p. 114.) With the later Byzantine budget it is obvious that great military expeditions were impossible.[91]

In the sixth century, military expeditions may have numbered

[91] Grosse argues on p. 269 that when Leo, the Emperor of the Eastern Romans, spent ten million solidi in the year 468 for armament against the Vandals the

15,000 men, but not more (see Grosse, p. 266). The destinies of the Empire were decided by small armies. The legions existed for the most part only on paper (Vegetius, I, 5). People preferred to serve in the *auxilia* because the discipline was looser and prizes were abundant (Vegetius, II, 3). From the time of Theodosius the *barbari*, Germans for the most part, made up the core of the army (see Grosse, p. 266).[92]

The expense of maintaining an army of very moderate size — about the same size as a European army before the French Revolution — was considerable for the agricultural countries which formed the Roman Empire. In Egypt, in the Byzantine period, that is, from the fifth century to Justinian, military expenses were probably not more than ten or fifteen per cent of the entire budget, but in the period of Diocletian the army of 10,000 or 15,000 men could be a heavy burden for the strained economic system of Egypt.[93] In the period of the great inflation, the military budget could have been heavy enough by itself to cause the complete collapse of the Imperial finances. During the inflationary period, soldiers were not only costly but were an element of great trouble, because they did not miss any opportunity of pillaging and kidnapping wealthy citizens for ransom.[94]

XI. The Annona Militaris and Its Exaction

The *annona* was paid in money by the taxpayer and dealt with in terms of gold. This is certainly true for the age of Justinian.[95]

Western Romans no longer had the means to prepare a strong army, still less a fleet. I hardly see how he came to this conclusion.

[92] It may be well worth while to establish how far the Roman army was recruited among the *barbari*, how far among *cives Romani*, and how far among *barbari* outside the borders of the Empire.

[93] See p. 433.

[94] Rostovtzeff, in his *Economic and Social History*, p. 444 ff., quotes the cases of pillage and murder in the cities of the Roman Empire in the third century. He tries to show that the soldiers, having been recruited from the peasantry after the third century, were the natural allies of the country people against the bourgeoisie of the towns. In the struggle between the peasants and soldiers on one side and the bourgeoisie of the provincial towns on the other, the middle class, according to Rostovtzeff, which composed the active citizenry of the towns of the Empire, was crushed. But there is no doubt that the soldiers, who were often *barbari*, made their inroads upon the peasants as much as they did upon the middle classes of the towns.

[95] See, for example, the entire account of the taxes of Aphrodito in P. Cairo

The *annona* was exacted by the ὑποδέκται or χρυσυποδέκται.[96] The *annona militaris* in the Byzantine period may be very easily distinguished from the *annona civica* or ἐμβολή. The *annona civica*, in the time of Justinian, amounts to about eight million artabas of wheat a year, exacted in kind. The *annona militaris*, which I think was exacted mostly in gold, might have covered the needs of about ten or fifteen thousand men and corresponded to the value of about 150,000 to 225,000 artabas of wheat. The other expenses for the *annona militaris*, which in the time of Justinian might have oscillated between 160,000 and 240,000 *solidi*, corresponded to 1,600,000 to 2,400,000 artabas. Doubtless the income of about 800,000 solidi from the *annona* covered many other expenses besides the *annona militaris*. The *annona militaris* was in charge of the *praefectus praetorio*; the *annona civica* in charge of the *praefectus annonae*. The 150–225 thousand artabas of wheat for the army were nearly negligible in comparison with the eight million artabas of the ἐμβολή. As I have already pointed out, the *annona militaris* was mostly bought with the money paid from the *arcarica*.

How the *annona* was exacted is shown by Nov. Just. 128, 1; Nov. Val. 35, 3; C. Just. X, 23, 4; C. Th. XI, 5, 4.[97] The μερικαὶ διατυπώσεις ordered by the *praefecti praetorio* and sent to the governors of the provinces indicated how much wheat, barley, wine, oil and money had to be exacted. The sum of the *annona* was divided among the provinces. Each *praeses* of a province made a further division and ordered the exaction of the *annona* from the towns, which in turn divided the amount required into sums for the villages.

In the Roman period, Wilcken,[98] Lesquier,[99] and Wallace [100] tell us that the method of obtaining supplies for the Egyptian legions was analogous to the method employed to maintain the entourages

67054, cf. Gelzer, *Archiv f. Pf.*, V, 346 ff.; and Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 222, as well as P. Oxy. 126 (A.D. 572), Wilcken, *Chrest.*, p. 180, where all taxes except the ἐμβολή and the ναῦλον are paid in gold. See, for comparison P. Grenf. II, 95, P. Klein. Format 95, 999, 1277.

[96] See Wilcken, p. 363, and my discussion of the exaction of the *vestis militaris* and *aurum tironicum*, p. 418 ff.

[97] See Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *adaeratio*.

[98] *Grundzüge*, p. 359.

[99] *L'armée romaine*, pp. 350 ff.

[100] *Taxation*, pp. 23 ff., 154 ff.

of *praeses* and prefects during their journeys through Egypt. It seems to me that, if this were so, the regular expense for the army could not have been paid from a specific source of revenue; probably the cases of supplies of *annonae* which we find occurring before the end of the second century A.D. concern troops which were not garrisoned. Wallace says that about the year 185 the *annona*, particularly in grain, was organized in a more regular fashion as a sort of surtax in kind levied upon grain land, and was very small.[101] It may be that in some cases the *annona* of grain was levied as a surtax on grain land, as in BGU I, 336 (216), but we do not have any evidence that it was paid regularly as a surtax, although it could have been added to the land tax without any specification. But while we have no means of checking the amount of surtax levied as land tax in order to find the variations caused by the *annona* in the Imperial period, we must bear in mind that the *annona* was positively paid as a tax, and chiefly as a land tax.[101a]

The *annona militaris* was supplied to the soldiers in kind, the prices being fixed by the administration at a low rate. Therefore soldiers had no interest in receiving an *annona adaerata*, which would have been of advantage to them only in far regions of the Empire where prices were very low, or in cases where soldiers cultivated their own land or where high officials were entitled to large numbers of *annonae* and *capita* which they could not use.[102] *An-*

[101] A surtax *annona* could not be individualized in the land surveys unless characterized as such. If we suppose that each soldier needed about one artaba each, then with an army of 15,000 soldiers each arura would have been imposed only 1/400 artaba.

[101a] Soldiers paid their *victum* with their *stipendia*. In the III cent. A.D. probably under the influence of the inflation the Administration provided that the *stipendium* of the soldiers had to be paid partially *in natura*. The gradual introduction of this sort of *annona militaris* might be connected with the passage of Herod. III 8 4, *τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐπέδωκε* (Severus) *χρήματα πλεῖστα, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ συνεχώρησεν ἃ μὴ πρότερον εἶχον· καὶ γὰρ τὸ σιτηρέσιον πρῶτος ηὔξησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ δακτυλίοις χρυσοῖς χρήσασθαι ἐπέτρεψε γυναιξί τε συνοικεῖν* κτλ., and with Dio 78 34, where Macrinus promised to the soldiers to give them back their *τροφή* and with Alexander Severus, *Vita*, cap. 15, "annonam militarem diligenter inspexit." These passages are quoted by H. Delbrueck, *op. cit.*, II, p. 225 f.

[102] Th. VII, 4, 14 (365): "Riparienses milites mensibus novem in ipsa specie consequantur annonam, pro tribus pretia percipiant." Th. VIII, 4, 17 (389?): in Illyricum the *comitatenses* soldiers received payment in kind, the *limitanei* money with an *adaeratio* which seems not unfavorable to them. Th. VII, 4, 30 (409): *Adaeratio* for the *limitanei* in Palestine in their interest and that of the *possessores*.

nonae not drawn upon by the soldiers after a certain time were forfeited.[103]

XII. The Annona and Its Exaction in Egypt

The *annona* of the Byzantine age was the most important land tax of Egypt. It belonged to the χρυσικά, i.e., it was exacted as a rule in gold, as an *aruratio*.[104] It must not be confused with the

---

Th. VII, 4, 31 (409): *Adaeratio* for the families of soldiers in Oriens and Egypt in the interest of the soldiers. *Annonae adaeratae* for the officials in Th. VII, 4, 35 (423) and C. Just. I, 52 (439); the officials received many *annonae*. *Annonae adaeratae* of the *tribuni*, of the *comites* and of the *praefecti numerorum* in Th. VII, 4, 36 (424).

The *duces* received their allowances of *annonae* and *capita* (Edict Just. XIII, 11, 1): The *Dux Lybiae* received 1005¼ solidi for 90 *annonae* and 120 *capita* (if the reading is correct), 400 solidi for the 50 *annonae* and 50 *capita* in gold, and for his office 187½ solidi. The *Augustalis* received 1200 solidi for his *annona* (Edict XIII, 1, 14?) out of the ἐξαγώγιον. The *annonae* of the *Dux Lybiae* were equivalent to 5.83 solidi, if the figures are correct.

[103] Th. VII, 4, 18 (393): "Ne quis pro speciebus annonariis pretia temptet exigere, vel si contra legem datam venire temptaverit, nec illud, quod in pretio expetit, permittatur exigere nec illud, quod suo tempore accipere neglexerit consequatur." This passage does not refer to the exaction of *annonae* in money from the provincials, but to the failure of soldiers to ask for their *annonae* from the proper office (de horreis) at the right time, the *annonae* thereupon being forfeited to the fiscus (Th. VII, 4, 17 [377]).

[104] I do not know whether, as seems probable, the *annona* was paid partially with a *capitatio*. In Illyria, according to Th. VII, 4, 32 (412), each *tributarius*, i.e., a *plebeius rusticus* who was a small landowner, had to pay ⅟120 *caput* for the *annona*, later ⅟60 and still later ⅟13. "Nam cum adaerationis aestimatio prius per centum et viginti capita exactione solidi teneretur, per sexaginta recens redigit aviditas exindeque iam nutrita licentia ad tredecim tributarios non dubitavit artare." I understand that the *tributarius* paid on his *capitatio* ⅟120, ⅟60 and ⅟13 of an *annona* of five *solidi*. The sentence of Th. VII, 4, 32: "Quas in dignitatibus constitutis id est rectores provinciarum et comites solent accipere," is not very clear to me. I understand "accipere" for the *annona*, not for their own annona. Th. VII, 4, 32, seems to me not to be related to C. J. I, 52. Perhaps in Numidia too the *annona* was paid as a *capitatio* as well as a *iugatio*, or at least under other titles than *iugatio*. Nov. Val. XIII (445): Numidia had to pay as land tax or under other taxes, 4200 *solidi*, 1200 *annonae* and 200 *capita* from the *gleba privata* and *emphyteutica* and the *perpetuarii* of the *domus divina* had to pay their *argentaria functio*. This figure represents one-eighth of the ordinary taxation paid by the province, because Valentinian granted the reduction of the tax to one-eighth.

This figure shows that the expenses of Numidia were 4200 sol. and 4800 sol. for *annona* and 800 for *capita* and an unknown figure for the *argentaria functio* of the *domus divina*. In Ammianus Marcellinus, XXI, 6, 6, the *annona* is a land tax levied on *iuga* and *capita*. In Egypt, vineyards paid the military *annona* as an *aruratio* in addition to the ordinary land-tax, as is now shown by Princeton III 119 (early IV cent.), l. 20.

annona civica or the *annona militaris*, a confusion commonly made by scholars.

The *annona militaris*, which was the allowance in kind given the soldiers, was bought from the territory where the soldier lived on the basis of the prices fixed by the *delegatio* (see, for example, P. Cairo 67320 [541–2 A.D.]). The *praeses* of the province authorized the *numerarius* to exact from each village so much wheat, wine, oil, etc., according to the *delegatio*, or, if the *delegatio* [105] was not yet on hand, according to a *praedelegatio*. Through this order the villages knew what they had to deliver and the prices they could ask for their supplies.[106] The villagers were compelled to sell a certain amount of commodities, which were paid for by the administration with money collected in the course of ordinary taxation. The *annona militaris* was not always paid exclusively from the receipts of the gold *annona*.[107]

The compulsory sale of their goods could be more ruinous to the villagers than a heavy tax.[108] The principles on which the sales were conducted in the Byzantine age were the same as in the Roman period.[109] The prefect of Egypt would order, let us say, twenty thousand artabas of barley to be bought in the Hermopolites for the Ala Apriana in Coptos. The πραγματικοί of the *nomoi* divided the amount into quantities for each village (ἐπιμερισμός) and the πρεσβύτεροι τῆς κώμης in the village had to deliver the barley. Sometimes they received the money directly from the soldiers, sometimes through the administration of the town, or through the central government.

In P. Grenf., I, 48 [W., *Chrest.*, 416] (191 A.D.) a soldier appointed to exact the *annona* declared to the πρεσβύτεροι of the village that he had received the barley which they were ordered to sell him with the ἐπιμερισμός by the πραγματικοί, and that he had paid the ἀγοραστικὴν τιμὴν ἐξ ἔθους. In P. Amh. 107 (185 A.D.) (W., *Chrest.*, 417), a soldier, a *duplicarius*, received the barley from the πρεσβύτεροι τῆς κώμης, and gave them an *apocha* in which he declared that he had received a number of artabas of barley μετρήσει

[105] For the *delegatio*, see G. Rouillard[2], p. 87 ff., 106.

[106] Gelzer, *Byzant. Verwaltung*, pp. 39–41.

[107] See for example the case of the ἐξαγώγιον in G. Rouillard,[2] p. 112. In Egypt the annona was the most important tax.

[108] Doubtless at the height of the inflation.

[109] Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 359 f.

τῇ κελευσθείσῃ according to the ἐπιμερισμός of the πραγματικοί of the *nomos*. In this case the *duplicarius* did not pay for the barley directly. Probably the πρεσβύτεροι used the *apocha* as an order on the administration of the metropolis, as appears in B.G.U. III, 842 (Hermopolites) where the πρεσβύτερος gave a receipt to the *liturgus*, stating that he had received the price of the commodity, and from P. Amh. 109 (185–86 A.D.), W., *Chrest.* 418, where the πρεσβύτεροι declared to the *strategos* that they received from the *liturgi*, a *cosmetes* and an *agoranomos* of Hermoupolis the price of the barley which was required from the village, according to the ἐπιμερισμός of the πραγματικοί. We suppose that the normal way of paying the *annona*, even before the administrative reforms of Severus, was the following:

A soldier, e.g., a *duplicarius*, exacted the barley from the village, so many artabas at a fixed price. He did not pay, but left a receipt. The elders received their money from the town magistrates, from the treasury of the town. The elders, and probably the *liturgi* of the metropolis, notified the *strategos* of the transaction. The liturgi were very probably paid by the government through the *strategos* and the prefect.

The soldiers did not pay the elders directly; if they did, they had to be reimbursed later by the government. Normally the treasury of the metropolis financed the purchase of the *annonae*.

In the fourth century, the *curiales* had to care for the *annonariae species* of the army. The ἐπιμεληταί of the *annona* were responsible directly to the government, but they were guaranteed by the βουλή. After the *epimeletai* had exacted the *annonariae species* they had to deliver them to the *erogatores*.[110] The *epimeletai curatores*, who collected the *annonae*, delivered them to the *erogatores*. The *erogator* handed over to the curator an *antapochon*, a receipt for *annonae*, and the *curator* an *apocha* to the *erogator*. The *antapochon* remained in the hands of the *epimeletai*, the *apocha* in the hands of the *diadotai*.[111]

The διαδόται brought the *annonae* into the *horrea* (ὅρρια), the

[110] Mitteis, *Sav. Z.*, 1907, 385, P. Lips., p. 286 f., M. Gelzer, *Studien*, p. 50, W., *Grundzüge*, p. 262 f.

[111] For ἀντάποχον and ἀποχή, σύμβολον and ἀντισύμβολον, see Wilcken, *Archiv*, III, 392 ff., and W., *Chrest.*, 85, line 15. Nov. Just. 128, 3, deals with this system of receipts and antireceipts. See the remarks on the ἐντάγιον in Rouillard², p. 119.

public storehouses (*θησαυροί*), and delivered them to the *tribuni* and *praepositi* of the soldiers, who brought in their daily requests with a *pittacium authenticum*.[112] When the *annonae* were in the *horrea* the responsibility for them was laid upon the *erogatores*, as appears from Th. VII, 4, 1. [325] (C J. XII, 37).

Curatores and *erogatores* were appointed for single *species annonariae*, e.g., wine, oil, chaff, etc. In the Byzantine period, as well as in earlier times, the City Council financed the business, but sometimes, in the fourth century, this operation proved disastrous. In B.G.U. IV, 1027 (W., *Chrest.*, 424) the *praeses* of the Thebais warned the *exactores* and the council of Hermoupolis because for three years they had not delivered the *annonae* to the soldiers, as was their duty. I do not think that the council of Hermoupolis had to pay the *annona* to the soldiers on its own account, but I suppose that Hermoupolis had to purchase the commodities for the troops at the prices of the *delegatio*, and was unable to do so because these fixed prices, low enough to begin with, had become quite inadequate owing to the prevailing inflation. Under these circumstances the supply of the *annona* inevitably became impossible. The same system of supply was used for the *vestis militaris*, which was also a sort of *annonaria species*, properly an *anabolica species*.[113]

[112] Th. VII, 4, 11 (364?): "Susceptor antequam diurnum pittacium authenticum ab actuariis susceperit non eroget. Quod si absque pittacio facta fuerit erogatio id quod expensum est damnis eius potius subputetur . . . nec pri(us) de horreis species proferantur et maximae capitationis, quam ut dictum est ad diem pittacia authentica fuerint prorogata." Here "capitatio" means "annona."

[113] A minor question, the meaning of the receipts of *annona*, and receipts *ὑπὲρ τιμῆς* of barley: Wilcken, *Ostraka* 679, 698; *ὑπὲρ τιμῆς* of wine and dates: Wilcken, *Ostraka* 1262; or without *annona*, only *ὑπὲρ τιμῆς*, Wilcken, *Ostraka*, I, p. 276, 312 (see Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 261, and Lesquier, *L'armée romaine*, p. 358 ff.). Here Wilcken seems to me to understand correctly that the ostraka *ὑπὲρ τιμῆς* are payments of the government treasury for the *annona* paid the individual assessed with the *ἐτιμερισμός*. But I do not think it necessary to suppose, as Wilcken does (on p. 361, following Rostovtzeff, Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *annona militaris*), that "unentgeltliche Auflagen in den einzelnen Landesteilen zur Verpflegung der in ihnen stationierten Truppen erhoben seien, zu denen mehr zur Ergänzung jene Ankaüfe hinzugekommen seien." If Wilcken means that an entire province, such as Egypt, may be assessed with an additional land tax for the *annona*, he is right, but if he supposes that an Egyptian nome may be bound to supply *annonaria species* without being paid for it, I think he probably is incorrect.

BYZANTINE LAW IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY AND ITS RECEPTION BY THE GERMANS AND THE ARABS

By R. S. Lopez

The last fifty years have produced a good crop of studies in Byzantine law. Italian and Russian scholars were particularly active in this field: I shall quote only the names of Ferrini, Brandileone, Siciliano Villanueva, Ferrari delle Spade, Vasilevski, Uspenski, Pančenko, Vernadsky. But almost every nation has given its contribution — America with Ashburner, France with Monnier, Greece with Christophilopoulos and Ghinis, Roumania with Spulber, Finland with Mickwitz, Hungary with Darkkó, England with Freshfield, Poland with Berger, and so forth.

Nevertheless, one cannot say that the advance in the history of law has been as great as in other branches of Byzantine studies. We still lack a general manual of Byzantine law to take the place of Zachariae's *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*; and this book, valuable as it was as a pioneer's work, now is outdated. Also outdated is Siciliano Villanueva's *Diritto Bizantino* — rather a history of sources and of their influence in Italy than a complete survey of Byzantine legal thought. The bibliographic materials collected by Albertoni and by Maridakis, with a view to a new general treatise, have not been utilized as yet.[1]

As for individual sources, while most of the smaller law books and many documents are available in good critical editions, the Basilics — the greatest monument of Greco-Roman jurisprudence — can be used only in the century-old edition of Heimbach. This edition was sharply criticized by Zachariae, even when it first appeared. Yet, even now, the growing demand for a new and

[1] K. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts* (3rd ed., Berlin, 1893); L. Siciliano Villanueva, *Diritto bizantino* (an offprint of *Enciclopedia Giuridica Italiana*, Milan, 1906); A. Albertoni, *Per una esposizione del diritto bizantino con riguardo all'Italia* (Imola, 1927); G. S. Maridakis, in *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung, Röm. Abt.*, XLIX (1929), 518 ff.

better edition has found no answer.[2] No wonder, then, if our knowledge of the *Basilics* as a product of the Byzantine mind has made no progress in the last hundred years.

A hundred years ago, Eastern Rome was still considered to have been much like Gibbon's picture, a stagnant or decadent civilization. Accordingly, the *Basilics* were regarded as a concoction of Justinian's *Corpus Juris* — with only a few unimportant accessions from the *Procheiros Nomos* and the *Epanagoge* — and they were studied exclusively as a supplementary source of Roman law. To Heimbach, Zachariae, and their generation, laws of the *Basilics* which could not be found in the extant manuscripts of the *Corpus Juris* were nevertheless to be ascribed to Justinian and his Corpus, as though the later emperors had never issued a law.[3] Yet Leo VI, in his introduction to the *Basilics*, had declared that no enactment deserving of inclusion had been omitted from earlier times "down to our own decrees." Today, however, the prejudice that Byzantine law and civilization practically did not change over a thousand years has been overcome. It is time to apply to the *Basilics* the methods of investigation which have yielded such good results for the monuments of Roman law. In the *Basilics*, as in the *Corpus Juris*, we must look for new laws and for interpolations in old ones, so that the numerous archaisms of this law book may not conceal from us the real evolution of law from the sixth to the tenth century.[4]

On the other hand, we do have a number of Byzantine law books whose independence from Roman sources has never been

[2] Cf., for instance, A. A. Vasiliev, "Justinian's Digest," *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, V (1939), 734; L. Wenger, *Der heutige Stand der römischen Rechtswissenschaft* (Munich, 1927), p. 22; Mitteis, in *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung, Röm. Abt.*, XXXIV (1913), 406 ff.

[3] Cf. for instance, K. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, "Von den griechischen Bearbeitung des Codex," *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung, Röm. Abt.*, VIII (1887), 73 ff.; also Siciliano Villanueva, *Dir. biz.*, p. 77 ff.; P. Collinet, in *C.M.H.*, IV, 713 (a little less sharp). The judgment of Heimbach and Zachariae is also accepted in the most recent works, such as Ferrari's article "Bizantina civiltà, diritto" (in *Enciclopedia Italiana*), and F. H. Lawson, "The Basilica," *The Quarterly Law Review*, XLVI (1930), 486–501 and XLVII (1931), 536–556.

[4] To be sure, Leo VI did not fulfill entirely the promises uttered in his own preface to the Basilics (cf. Lawson, XLVI, 491 ff.) and embodied without revision many laws which had fallen into obsolescence. But of Justinian, too, it was said that "often he modified some texts only, as though he wanted to make a show of his will, and kept the other ones with a historical value," P. Bonfante, *Storia del diritto romano* (3rd ed., Milan, 1923), p. 155. I think that a thorough investigation of the Basilics would prove that the Macedonian Emperors and their lawyers

disputed. The oldest among these, at the time of Zachariae, were ascribed to the Isaurian emperors. More recent studies tend to ascribe all such Byzantine law books, except one, either to the Macedonian dynasty or to the period *before* the Isaurians.[5] At any rate, it is beyond doubt that all these law books embodied customs which had been growing for centuries in tribunal practice.[6] Some of these customs may have been enforced in written laws by emperors of the late sixth and early seventh centuries, though no legal text of this early period comes down to us, except for a few novels, mostly unimportant. Among the emperors of this period, Heraclius deserves the greatest attention as a possible lawgiver. The creation of the themes, which was formerly ascribed to the Isaurian emperors, is now regarded mainly as an achievement of Heraclius.[7] It is most probable that he enacted other reforms in various fields.[8] Therefore, we ought to be on the alert for possible new laws of Heraclius.

---

acted much the same way as Justinian, even though their minds were less fertile in innovations and more inclined to archaism.

[5] See the conclusions of G. Ostrogorsky, "Über die vermeintliche Reformtätigkeit der Isaurier," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXX (1929–30), 394–400. Further bibliography in A. A. Vasiliev, *Histoire de l'Empire Byzantin* (Paris, 1932), I, 319–30; we must add the essay of D. Ghinis, "Ζητήματά τινα ἐκ τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν Ἰσαύρων," Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν, X (1933), 43 ff., and numerous works on the Book of the Prefect.

[6] On the part which custom and imperial legislation played in the development of Byzantine law see the excellent general remarks of F. Brandileone, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVII (1908), 553–8; cf. also A. Andréadès, "Deux livres recents sur les finances byzantines," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXVIII (1928), 287–8. Next to the *Basilics*, Leo VI's *Novels* have been regarded down to very recent times as the most archaistic and unoriginal Byzantine law book. Now a more favorable view on the originality of these *Novels* is held by several scholars: See, for instance, G. Ferrari, "Di alcune leggi bizantine riguardanti il litorale marino . . . ," *Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere*, XLII (1909), 590 ff.; C. A. Spulber, *Les novelles de Leon le Sage* (Cernauti, 1934), p. 78 ff. But they ascribe innovations rather to the influence of popular custom than to that of written law, and do not put the problem as to whether Leo VI's novels were influenced by novels of the seventh and eighth centuries which do not come down to us. Ostrogorsky's new suggestion, which makes of Stylianos the real author of the novels (see also C. Kržišnik, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXXVII [1937], 489 ff.) seems too sweeping. As a matter of fact, Leo VI's legislative activity continued after the death of Stylianos, with the Book of the Prefect.

[7] The most recent contribution on this subject is that of E. Darkkó, "La militarizazzione dell' Impero Bizantino," *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, V (1939), 90 ff. This essay throws some new light on a development which had been already reconstructed by Diehl, Gelzer and Stein.

[8] That Heraclius may have reformed the University of Constantinople is now doubted by B. Brehier, "Notes sur l'histoire de l'enseignement supérieur à Con-

Unfortunately, it is highly improbable that we discover the original text of any novels of Heraclius other than those which we now have, and which had no durable importance. But in Barbarian law books, or even in Arabic sources of the time of Heraclius, we may find new enactments which have no precedents in Germanic or Arab customs, and appear in those later Byzantine law books which come down to us. There can be no doubt that the civilization of Eastern Rome had a constant and deep influence on the art, religious life, military organization, and administrative machinery of the Barbarian kingdoms. The Arabs developed a stronger and more original civilization than the Germans; but, at first, they borrowed abundantly from Greco-Roman institutions. Hence it may be expected that new laws of Heraclius, if there were any, were not without echoes in the legal courts of the Barbarian states and of the early Caliphate.[9]

If our investigation is successful, we have hit two birds with one stone: we shall have reconstructed a lost Byzantine law, and we shall have proved that such a law was taken over in the codes of other nations.

* * * *

I think that reception can be proved at least for the laws dealing with forgery of coins, official seals, and public documents. All of these materials were closely guarded state monopolies under the later Roman Empire. On the one hand, they were regarded as public utilities; therefore, it was a duty of the state to guard its citizens against abuses in this field. On the other hand, the issuing of coins, seals, and special papyrus for documents was regarded as a function strictly connected with sovereign power, — that is, as a *regale*. Thus the crime of counterfeiting these mate-

---

stantinople," *Byzantion*, IV (1929). But he probably suppressed the doles of bread (cf. G. I. Bratianu, *Etudes byzantines d'histoire économique et sociale* [Paris, 1938], p. 135 ff.) and was the author of important monetary reforms (see below, n. 37 ff.). Grégoire has discovered that Heraclius assumed a new title, "New Constantine," after his victory over the Persians; he seems to be also the first emperor who officially adopted the title of *Basileus*. See also A. Pernice, *L'imperatore Eraclio* (Florence, 1905), p. 99 ff.

[9] So far, the only attempt at tracing back the direct influence of a Byzantine law on Barbarian legislation was that of E. Stein, "Des Tiberius Constantinus Novelle περὶ ἐπιβολῆς und der Edictus domni Chilperici regis," *Klio*, XVI (1920), 72–4. But of the law of Tiberius we have the original text.

rials was both an offense against public faith and an outrage to the emperor (in other words, a crime of lèse majesté). According to Sulla's *lex Cornelia de falsis* and to Ulpian, such a crime was to be punished by death. For a short time Constantine I reduced the penalty for free men to seizure of goods and deportation or work in the mines; but Constantius II re-established the capital penalty for all money-forgers, regardless of rank, and Justinian dropped the milder enactment of Constantine. Even refusing old coins which bore the effigy of a dead sovereign was regarded as a crime of lèse majesté and punished by death, from the time of Constantius II to that of Justinian.[10] Owing to the sacred character of the later Emperors, lèse majesté was regarded now as an outright sacrilege.

On the contrary, the Germanic peoples at home had no clear notion of the connection of coinage rights with sovereign power. When they established their rule over Roman territory, they did not object to money being struck in their states with the effigy of the Eastern emperors. In their typical wergelds fixed in proportion to different crimes and varying social rank, there was no fine for counterfeiting money or documents. Whatever control of coinage was inherited from Rome fell rapidly into obsolescence in the Merovingian and Anglo-Saxon states. In England, in France, and in Spain public moneyers were allowed to strike coins for private citizens, outside the public mints.[11] The Visigoths, it is true, took over at least the notion that all forgeries of documents and coins are harmful to the public welfare. But these crimes no longer involved a violation of sovereign prerogatives; hence they were no more than common forgeries and thefts, liable

[10] Ulp., *Dig.*, XLVIII, 10, 8–9; 13, 6; Paul., *ibid.*, 10, 19 and *Sent.*, V, 25, 1; *Cod. Th.*, IX, 21, 1–10; 22, 1; 23, 1; XI, 21, 1; XII, 7, 2; *Cod. Just.*, IX, 24, 1–3; XI, 1–3; also Cic., *Verr.*, II, 1, 42; Arrian., *Comm. Epict.*, III, 3; and cf. G. Humbert, "Moneta falsa" in Darenberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire d'antiquités*. I have dealt with this subject in detail in my article "Mohammed and Charlemagne, a revision," *Speculum*, XVIII (1943), 14–38.

[11] Cf. A. Luschin von Ebengreuth, *Allgemeine Münzkunde und Geldgeschichte des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit* (2nd ed., Munich, 1926), p. 235–288; U. Monneret de Villard, "La moneta in Italia durante l'alto medioevo," *Rivista italiana di numismatica*, XXXIII (1920), 190 ff.; J. De Morgan, "Evolutions et révolutions numismatiques," *Mélanges G. Schlumberger* (Paris, 1924), II, 285 ff.; M. Bloch, "Le problème de l'or au moyen-âge," *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, V (1933), 22 ff. (with bibliogr.); and my article in *Speculum*, cited above.

to the usual punishment for forgery and theft as in Roman law. Similarly, refusing old coins was punished with a fine.[12]

However, in two later laws of the Visigoths ascribed to Chindaswinth and Receswinth by the best manuscripts, a fine was maintained only for persons above a certain rank. A *minor persona* who counterfeited royal documents and their seals, or a slave who forged money was liable to a new penalty, the cutting off of a hand. In one of the laws, a naive explanation is given for the peculiar penalty: the hand to be cut off (it is said) is the instrument which committed the crime.[13]

Nevertheless, forgeries of royal charters seem to have continued. To escape direct conviction, many persons would dictate a false charter to a public notary, who would certify it in good faith. For this particular crime, a third law extended the penalty to all offenders, regardless of rank. The mutilation was to be preceded by flogging and shaving, — a degrading punishment which is found very often in later Byzantine law.[14] Chindaswinth (642–653) and Receswinth (653–672) reigned shortly after the death of Heraclius (641). No other law in the whole Visigothic code, except these three, enforces corporal mutilations; we find only the classic Roman penalties or the Germanic scale of wergelds.

In Italy, the Ostrogoths allowed almost no changes in the Roman legislation on money and public documents.[15] Under the

[12] *Lex Visig.*, VII, 5; 2–8; 6, 3–5. These laws, except for VII, 5, 2, are designated by most manuscripts as "antiquae" — that is, coming from the Code of Leovigild. Cf. the footnotes of K. Zeumer, the editor, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*; H. Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1887), I, 320 ff.; R. de Ureña y Smenjaud, *Historia de la literatura juridica española* (Madrid, 1906), II, part III (with bibliogr.).

[13] *Lex Visig.*, VII, 5, 1; 6, 2. The latter law is ascribed to Receswinth by four Mss., to Chindaswinth by one, while a late Ms. calls it "antiqua," certainly by mistake. The first law is included with no indication of author by thirteen Mss. (a fourteenth Ms. calls it "antiqua"), but it is evidently of the same author as the following law (VII, 5, 2), which is ascribed to Chindaswinth by the majority of the Mss. As a matter of fact, 5, 1 deals with forgery of royal charters and their seals, and 5, 2 deals with forgery of private documents and their seals; the terminology is almost identical in both laws.

[14] *Lex Visig.*, VII, 5, 9. One manuscript ascribes this law to Receswinth. Other mss. include it with no indication of author. It is evident that this law fills a gap of 5, 1, and, therefore, must be somewhat later.

[15] Cassiod., *Var.*, V, 39; VI, 7; VII, 32; and cf. W. Wroth, *Catalogue of the coins of the Vandals, Ostrogoths and Lombards . . . in the British Museum* (London, 1911), p. XXIX–XXXI and 43 ff (with bibliogr.).

Lombards, on the contrary, all traces of a regular state coinage seem to have disappeared for sixty years; the only extant coins of this period were evidently struck for private citizens, independently of state control.

However, one year after the accession of Chindaswinth and two years after the death of Heraclius, King Rothari gave to the Lombards their first code. Again, in the whole edict we find only Germanic wergelds or, seldom, Roman penalties. But amputation of the hand is the penalty for two crimes only: any offence against the royal monopoly of coinage, and any forgery of charters, — and the rank of the offender, here, is not taken into account. The first of these two laws uses the expression: "let him be *fined* by the cutting off of a hand," as though the legislator tried to reduce the unusual punishment to the indigenous system of fines.[16] Curiously enough, these laws have been pointed out by great scholars as a proof of the influence of Visigothic legislation on Lombard law.[17] But the edict of Rothari is as early as, or earlier than Chindaswinth's laws, and earlier than Receswinth's!

At the opposite end of the Mediterranean, the Arabs were slowly building up the administrative machinery of their state. The models were supplied by the Sasanian and Byzantine administrations, but the Arabs introduced many elements of their own. With them, too, there had been at first no connection of sovereign power with coins, seals or public instruments. But, under Omar I (a contemporary of Heraclius), the great seal of the Caliphate was counterfeited. In doubt as to what kind of penalty should be inflicted, the Caliph asked advice of the bystanders. One suggested the cutting off of a hand; but the opinion of other, more traditionalist advisors prevailed, and the forger was only flogged and imprisoned.[18] The problem occurred again and again in the

[16] *Ed. Roth.*, 242 and 243; see also *Ed. Liutpr.*, 91; *Concordia*, XXIX; *Liber Papiensis*, in Roth., 242, 243; *Lombarda*, I, 28, 1; XXIX, 1–2; and cf. Monneret de Villard, XXXIII, 132 ff.; A. Solmi, *L'amministrazione finanziaria del regno italico* (Pavia, 1932), p. 113 ff.; G. P. Bognetti, "Longobardi e Romani," in *Studi di storia e diritto in onore di Enrico Besta* (Milan, 1937–38), IV, 375 (with bihliogr.).

[17] Cf. N. Tamassia, *Le fonti dell editto di Rotari* (Pisa, 1889); E. Besta, *Storia del diritto italiano, le fonti* (Milan, 1923), I, part I, 37 ff. — A Byzantine influence on the Lombard chancery has been pointed out by several scholars; cf., for instance, G. Romano, *Le dominazioni barbariche in Italia* (Milan, 1910), p. 297 ff.

[18] al-Balādhuri, transl. Hitti and Murgotten (New York, 1916–24), II, 257 ff.;

last part of the seventh century and in the beginning of the eighth, when sovereign monopoly was being extended to coinage. There always were rulers and lawyers open to foreign influence, who advocated amputation of the hand as the proper penalty for money-forgers; but the *fukaha* of Mecca stubbornly opposed this practice, and stood for a bastinado, or even no punishment at all.[19]

In France itself, hand-cutting was enforced first as a penalty against counterfeiters during the short-lived Carolingian-Byzantine entente. In 814 the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle settled the differences between the old Eastern Empire and the new Empire of the West, and established new rules to facilitate commercial intercourse between the two states. Four or five years later, Louis the Pious ordered a new capitulary against money-forgers to be embodied in the Frankish Law. The capitulary enforced cutting off of a hand.[20]

Obviously this law presupposed a clearer notion of royal monopoly of currency than had the Merovingians. Too, the restoration of currency monopoly had progressed along with the progress of Italian and Byzantine influence on the Frankish monarchs. The first step towards re-establishing some control over the moneyers was taken by Pepin the Short immediately after his first Italian expedition and his capture of the formerly Byzantine city, Ravenna.[21] The manufacture of coins, however, remained sub-

268. Cf. also A. Grohmann, *Allgemeine Einführung in die Arabischen Papyri* (Vienna, 1924), p. 77 ff.; *id.*, art. "Tirāz," in *Encycl. of the Islam*; N. Abbott, *The Kurrah Papyri from Aphrodito in the Oriental Institute* (Chicago, 1938), p. 10 ff. More details and bibliogr. in my *Speculum* article.

[19] al-Balādhuri, II, 266 ff. Cf. also H. Lavoix, *Catalogue des monnaies musulmanes . . . de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1887), I, xxxii ff.; J. Karabacek, "Die arabischen Papyrusprotokolle," *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie von Wissenschaften*, Vienna, CLXI (1908), 29 ff.; and sources quoted above n. 18.

[20] *Mon. Germ. Hist., Leges*, sect. II, I, p. 285 ("legibus addenda"). The preceding chapter deals with "his qui denarios bonos accipere nolunt." That a penalty is enforced for the latter transgression, is a point in common with Roman and Byzantine law (see above, n. 10, and cf. *Basil.*, LIV, 18, *rubr.*; *Nov. Leonis* VI, LII; *Eparch. Bibl.*, IV, 3). The penalty for refusing coins of good alloy is not death (as in Roman law) but a fine (as in Byzantine law).

[21] *Mon. Germ. Hist., Leges*, sect. II, I, p. 32; the capitulary which contains this law has been put in connection on other points with the edict of Rothari and with the laws of Ratchis, another Lombard king. Thus Lombard influence is evident on Pepin's law. Another capitulary of Pepin deals with currency, but we know of it only through a reference of the synod of Reims (year 813).

stantially a private business. Charlemagne endeavored both to outlaw private minting and to oblige his vassals to acknowledge his rule by putting his name on their coins and charters. Still, he did not secure full enforcement of these reforms.[22] In his own mind Frankish traditionalism still conflicted with Roman and Byzantine influences.[23] Even Louis the Pious, in another capitulary, showed some wavering as to the proper penalty for counterfeiters.[24] It is only under Charles the Bald that the amputation penalty for money-forgers wins the day. Charles the Bald is accused by a chronicler (not without reason) of having "spurned Frankish tradition for the Byzantine vanity." [25]

In England both the restoration of royal monopoly on currency and the amputation of the hand as a penalty for counterfeiters go back to Aethelstan (925–941). Aethelstan's charters are the first ones in Western Europe in which a ruler is called with the Byzantine imperial title of *Basileus*.[26] His law against counterfeiters explains the penalty with nearly the same words as those used by the Visigoth law-giver three hundred years earlier: the hand to be cut, it is said, is the instrument which committed the

[22] The history of the monetary reforms of the Carolingians is heavily scarred from old battles of numismatists, historians and economists: cf. especially M. Prou, *Catalogue des monnaies carolingiennes de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1896), intro.; A. Dopsch, *Die Wirtschaftsentwicklung der Karolingerzeit* (2nd ed., Weimar, 1922), II; A. Segrè, "La circolazione monetaria del regno dei Franchi," *Rivista Storica Italiana*, XLVIII (1931), with bibliogr. Probably the very disagreement of scholars depends on the fact that Carolingian laws were not absolute (as with the Lombards, the Greeks and the Romans) but rather theoretic statements which fell into an unresponsive atmosphere, and left room for repentance, exception, and privilege. Here is an instance, taken from a capitulary of 806: "Volumus ut nullo alio loco moneta sit nisi in palatio nostro, *nisi forte a nobis iterum aliter fuit ordinatum*."

[23] Cf. E. Sabbe, "L'importation des tissus orientaux en Europe occidentale au haut moyen-âge," *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, XIV (1935), p. 811; also (despite his abuse of rhetoric) E. Rota, "La consacrazione imperiale di Carlomagno," *Studi E. Besta* (Milan, 1937–9), III, 187 ff.; and see my paper in *Speculum*.

[24] *Mon. Germ. Hist., Leges*, sect. II, I, 285, 290 and 299; see also the capitulary of Lothar, of 832 (*ibid.*, II, 63).

[25] *Mon. Germ. Hist., Leges*, sect. II, II, 310 ff. (edict of Pîtres, 864).

[26] Aethelst., II, 14; H. Pierquin, *Recueil général des Chartes Anglo-Saxonnes* (Paris, 1912), II, 60 and 66; III, 91, 92, 93, 96; cf. W. Gray Birch, "Index of the Styles and Titles of English Sovereigns," *Report of the first annual Meeting of the Index Society* (London, 1879), p. 67 ff.; E. E. Stengel, "Kaisertitel und Souveränitatsidee," *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters*, III (1939), 5 ff. At about the same time the king of Bulgaria took up the title of Basileus; but, in Western Europe, there were no other examples outside England.

crime.[27] Before Aethelstan, hand cutting was enforced only for sacrilegious theft, or for thieves caught red-handed.[28]

* * * *

To sum up, the amputation of the hand for forgeries of coins, seals and public documents was introduced in two Germanic codes and into Arab legal practice at the time of Heraclius, or shortly after his death. In two other Barbaric codes, its introduction occurred when Byzantine influence was strong. The penalty was foreign to the national Germanic and Arabic customs; in the Barbaric states its enforcement was almost entirely confined to the special field of currency and public documents.[29]

Corporal mutilations were foreign to classic Roman law also. However, in the tribunals of the later Roman Empire, mutilations were some times inflicted instead of the capital penalty. Cutting off a hand was regarded by popular feeling as the proper penalty for crimes of lèse majesté; it was inflicted on three usurpers in the late fourth century and in the early fifth.[30] A law of Justinian implies practical toleration of hand-cutting as a customary penalty, although no corporal mutilations find place in his own laws.[31] Finally, the earliest extant Byzantine law book dealing with criminal law (the Isaurian *Ecloga*) enforces corporal mutilations for nearly all crimes. Cutting off a hand is the penalty for all crimes of lèse majesté, and, in particular, for the counterfeiting of coins.[32] The same punishment is enforced again and again, both for counterfeiting coins and for forging seals and public documents, in all later Byzantine law books — including

[27] *Lex Visig.*, VII, 5, 1: "manum perdat, per quam tantum crimen admisit," Athelst., II, 14, 1: "slea mon of þa hond, ðe he ðæt fúl mid worhte."

[28] Ine, 18 and 37; Alfred, 6. In the second case, a foot might be cut instead of a hand.

[29] Only in the *Lex Gundebadi* do we find hand-cutting enforced for several crimes. But Burgundian legislation was much more directly influenced by Roman law *and Roman customs* than the Anglo-Saxon, Visigoth or Lombard legislation.

[30] In 392 Rufinus, suspected of aspiring to the throne, was killed by the populace and his right hand was severed from his lifeless arm. A few years later John had a hand cut off and was executed; before being raised to the emperorship he had been a *primicerius notariorum*, entrusted with the keeping of state documents. Finally, Attalus had a finger and a thumb amputated, but he was spared the capital sentence.

[31] *Nov. Just.*, CXXXIV, 13. See also *Nov. Maior.*, IV (but this novel was not included in Justinian's Code).

[32] *Ecloga*, XVII, 18; forgery of seals and public documents is not dealt with at all in this law book.

the *Basilics* and the *Book of the Prefect* — and in all private manuals of Eastern Roman law.[33] One of the latter, indeed, words the two laws against forgers of coins and of documents with nearly the same phrases as the edict of Rothari.[34]

Thus cutting off a hand was a popular punishment for forgers of coins, seals and public documents from the fifth century on in Byzantine territory. Justinian tolerated it without giving it official recognition. All the extant Byzantine law books have hand-cutting as the regular penalty, — but no extant law book is earlier than the late seventh century, and Heraclius, Rothari and Chindaswinth ruled in the first half of this century.[35] However, an anonymous scholium of the Basilics apparently supplies us the first link in the transition. It seems that, when the scholiast was writing (perhaps only a few years after the promulgation of the *Corpus Juris*), legal practice maintained the capital penalty for money-counterfeiters (as in Roman law) only if these were slaves. Free men were fined, as in Visigothic law.[36]

But fines did not fit into the Byzantine system of penalties so

[32] *Ecl. priv. aucta*, XVII, 44 and 45; *Proch. Nomos*, XXXIX, 14; *Epanag.*, XL, 17; *Ecl. ad Proch. Mut.*, XVIII, 28; *Basil.*, LX, 41, 8 and 60, 1; *Eparch. Bibl.*, III, 1 and 2; Attaliates, LXXXVI, 1; Harmenopoulos, VI, 14, 3, etc. Besides, according to *Eparch. Bibl.*, II, 5, cutting off a hand is the penalty for goldsmiths who forge *unsealed* metals; we may infer that those who forged metals with seals were punished the same way.

[34] *Ecl. priv. aucta*, XVII, 44 and 45; cf. *Ed. Roth.*, 242 and 243. Scholars have spoken of Italian influences on the *Ecloga privata* (bibliogr. in E. Freshfield, *A revised Manual of Roman Law* (Cambridge, 1927), introd.); but, at least for these chapters, there may have been instead an influence of Byzantine law on Lombard law.

[35] Indeed, the only law book which, in all probability, belongs to the VIIth century and to the Heraclian dynasty (cf. G. Vernadsky, "Sur les origines de la Loi agraire byzantine," *Byzantion*, II [1925], 169 ff.) concerns agricultural life, and, therefore, we cannot expect to find in it anything connected with our subject.

[36] *Schol. ad Basil.*, LX, 41, 8. This scholium, based on Ulpian (*Dig.*, XLVIII, 10, 19), doctors up its text, evidently in order to make it fit a changed situation: the result is a vague and confused statement. As a matter of fact, Ulpian distinguished between slaves (who "summo supplicio affici debent") and free men (who must be thrown "ad bestias"). But the execution "ad bestias" had disappeared afterwards (cf. K. E. Zachariae, *Gesch. des griech.-röm. Rechts* [3rd ed., Berlin, 1892], p. 330 ff.) and the capital penalty probably was no longer enforced in all cases. Therefore the scholiast maintained the extreme penalty for the slaves, but suppressed the words "ad bestias" and replaced them by the words "*χρυσοῦ νν'*," transposed from the beginning of Ulpian's statement. Thus the free men appear to be liable to a fine of unspecified amount. This was almost a return to the short-lived law of Constantine the Great, which we mentioned ahove.

well as into the Germanic system of wergelds: indeed, Justinian had worked towards total suppression of fines. Thus another step was taken, and the cutting off of a hand (a milder penalty than death, as Emperor Leo III was to point out) was soon enforced. The fact that the same penalty was introduced in two Barbarian codes and into Arab legal practice just after the accession of Heraclius would suggest that Heraclius was the emperor who transformed the unwritten custom into a law, and that such a law had almost immediate reception in the West as well as in the East.[37] This thesis will be corroborated if we can find other proofs of a special activity of Heraclius in the fields of coinage and seals.

* * * *

The *Basilics* contain a regulation concerning the selection of the members of δημόσια σώματα, public corporations). This term is found only here; it can only mean colleges (guilds) which were attached to state industries — moneyers, manufacturers and dyers of regalian cloth, and probably arms-manufacturers.[38] We owe the text of the regulation to Cujas, who used a manuscript of the *Basilics*, now lost.

[37] The whole development can be summarized in the following table (which includes only *extant* enactments):

	SLAVES	FREE MEN
Ulpian	"summo supplicio"	"ad bestias"
Constantine	"ultimo supplicio"	seizure of goods, deportation or work in the mines (in proportion to rank)
Constantius II	"flammarum exustionibus"	
Justinian	"flammarum exustionibus"	
Schol. Basil.	"ἐσχάτην τιμωρίαν"	"χρυσοῦ νν′ διδόναι"
Lex Visig.	"dextera manu abscidat"	fine in proportion to rank
Ed. Rothari	"manu incisione multetur"	
Ecloga, Basil., etc.	"χειροκοπείσθω"	
Louis the Pious	"manus ei amputetur"	
Aethelstan	"slea mon of þa hand"	

[38] To these colleges both the Codes devoted two titles (*Cod. Th.*, X, 20 and 22; *Cod. Just.*, XI, 7 and 9). But they use no general term to qualify all of these colleges jointly, as distinguished from colleges not working in *state* factories. In the *Basilics* the titles LIV, 16 and 17 correspond to the mentioned titles of the Codes; however, the majority of the laws taken over in the *Basilics* are modified and interpolated. There are also at least two laws which have no parallel in the Codes, and some laws of the Codes apparently were not taken over. See below, n. 42 ff. and cf. R. S. Lopez, "Silk industry in the Byzantine Empire," *Speculum*, XX (1945).

All the editors of the *Corpus Juris* thought that the regulation discovered by Cujas must belong to Justinian's Code also, for it was agreed that there were no laws later than Justinian's in the *Basilics*.[39] Yet the very term, "public corporations" (δημόσια σώματα) would have been meaningless in Roman law. In the late Roman Empire all the colleges — whether attached to state factories or not — were regarded as public corporations, for they all were liable to corvée and responsible for tax-collection. A distinction appeared first in the Byzantine Empire, because the guilds engaged in private enterprises were almost entirely relieved from their obligations towards the state. Thus the numberless regulations enforced on private guilds by the Codes of Theodose II and Justinian were not taken over by the *Basilics*; it was left to the Book of the Prefect to enforce some restrictions on their activity. On the contrary, the *Basilics* did take over the Roman regulations on colleges attached to state factories, although many of the old laws were dropped or modified in harmony with a more liberal attitude towards the working classes.[40]

As a matter of fact, a regulation of 426 concerning the selection of the members of "corpor*a* . . . ad Divinas Largitiones nexu sanguinis pertinen*tia*" (corporations directly managed by the financial department) was dropped by the Basilics. This law, which was included in both the Roman Codes, is quite different from the fragment of Cujas. The aim of the Roman provision was to prevent state workers from shifting to other employment. According to the law of 426, members of the colleges of moneyers, manufacturers and dyers of regalian cloth and of military uniforms were allowed to withdraw from their corporations only if they could find a substitute, and if this substitute was approved by the Count of the Sacred Largesses. Even in this case, their goods were not released and their sons must enter the corporation.[40] In conclusion, although this law does not entirely forbid replacement, it still belongs to the very many provisions by which the emperors of the third and fourth centuries endeavored to keep at a constant and high level the dwindling ranks of college members.

On the contrary, the law partly preserved by Cujas aims at

[39] *Basil.*, LIV, 16, 16; also restored as *Cod. Just.*, XI, 7, 16.
[40] *Cod. Th.*, X, 20, 16 (=*Cod. Just.*, XI, 7, 13).

preventing the number of state workers from growing beyond the needs of the factories to which they were attached. Hence it cannot be ascribed to the same epoch as the law of 426. Nor can it be a law of Justinian's, for, in his time, only the state dye-houses were temporarily overcrowded; as for the other public factories, the problem still was one of insufficient personnel.[41] The earliest evidence that the law of 426 was becoming obsolete comes from a Byzantine city of Italy, Naples. In 599, a corrupt provincial subordinate of the Count of the Sacred Largesses arbitrarily released many members of a corporation working for the state, and hired substitutes for a bribe. The trustees of the guild complained to the Pope, who threatened action by a superior state officer, — not the Count of the Sacred Largesses, but the Prefect of Italy, the highest local authority.[42]

Irregularities of the same kind are denounced in the fragment of Cujas: there was disorder in the "public corporations" because many new members, unskilled and unfit for the profession, had been freely allowed to join the working staff. The new law established a thorough examination, to be supervised by the governors of the provinces (ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν) and by the provosts of the corporations. Admission to the state factories was reserved to the descendants or relatives of members, and no new appointment was allowed unless a vacancy occurred. In another law embodied in the Basilics, the emperor prohibits even himself from accepting new moneyers by overriding the regulation. This law, too, has no parallel in the Roman Codes.[43] Thus the state workers were given the status of an exclusive industrial caste.

[41] *Nov. Just.*, XXXVIII, 6; but *Cod. Just.*, 7 and 9, *passim*. Even in the dye-houses a shortage of workers must have occurred soon after the introduction of the silkworm in the Byzantine Empire, which caused a rapid boost of production. As a matter of fact, the *baphia* and the *gynaecia* (dye-houses and textile factories) of the Roman state were manned by male workers, while the Byzantine factories had to employ women too. Cf. *Basil.*, LIV, 16, 8: this law has no parallel in the Code. The preceding theme in the same title of the Basilics (LIV, 16, 7), while reproducing *Cod. Just.*, XI, 8, 5, modifies the penalty from 5 pounds' fine to 3 pounds.

[42] I am referring to the famous letter of Gregory I to the *saponarii* of Naples (Greg. I, *Epist.*, IX, 5). (This college, as I shall try to demonstrate in another essay, had been put under the officers of the Sacred Largesses like the colleges of state workers, because it sold a kind of "sacred soap" used by the sacred Emperor in his sacred bath.)

[43] *Basil.*, LX, 60, 2. Remarkably enough, the same restriction is enforced in the oldest regulations of the *sacramentum Imperii* and of the *Serment de France*, the

The examination set forth in the "fragment of Cujas" is much like the tests enforced by the tenth century Book of the Prefect.[44] The penalty, too, is the standard Byzantine punishment for guild offenses: flogging. A more precise time indication is supplied by the fact that the fragment of Cujas transfers the control over state corporations from the Count of the Sacred Largesses to the provincial governors. We know that "the title 'comes sacrarum largitionum' vanishes in the seventh century." The last minister whom we meet bearing the title is Anastasius in 608–9, one year before Heraclius' accession.[45] Then, the direction of state factories *at Constantinople* was handed over partly to the *eidikon*, partly to the *vestiarion*, both being central branches of treasury.[46] From the fragment of Cujas we may infer that *in the provinces* the state factories were placed under the provincial governors. With such a development we may connect the fact that Heraclius increased the number of the mints, so that practically there was one in every province.[47]

---

great guilds of moneyers which operated all over France, Northern Italy and Southern Germany in the later Middle Ages. The emperor, or the king, may not appoint moneyers foreign to the families of older guild members unless there is a vacancy which cannot be filled by relatives of members.

[44] In order to be appointed a "ταβουλάριος" a candidate had to undergo a severe inquiry, to obtain a favorable vote of the corporation and its *primikerios*, and finally to be confirmed by the Prefect of the City. The places were limited to twenty-four. Thus there were the same restrictions as the fragment of Cujas enforces for members of state colleges, except that descent from a member of a college (δμοεθνία) is not required for a notary (*Eparch. Bibl.*, I, 1–3 and 13; cf. also II, 1 and 4; III, 1; IV, 5; VI, 6; VII, 3; XII, 2). Limitations in the appointment of new members, according to the Book of the Prefect, are in direct proportion to the extent of connections of each guild with matters of state and public utility.

[45] Cf. J. B. Bury, *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century* (London, 1911), p. 86 ff.; E. Stein, *Studien zur Geschichte des Byzantinischen Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1919), p. 149 ff.; G. Millet, "L'origine du logothète général," *Mélanges F. Lot* (Paris, 1925), p. 563 ff. (with bibliogr.).

[46] *Kletorologion*, p. 141–2, ed. Bury; cf. Bury, p. 95 ff.; 100 ff.; Stein, p. 178 ff.; F. Dölger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Byzantinischen Finanzverwaltung* (Leipzig, 1927), p. 39 ff.; G. Millet, "Sur les sceaux des commerciaires byzantins," *Mélanges G. Schlumberger* (Paris, 1924), II, 306 ff.; J. Ebersolt, *Les arts somptuaires de Byzance* (Paris, 1923), p. 3 ff. and 78 ff. While the textile factories and the dyehouses (βασιλικὰ ἐργοδόσια) were placed under the *eidikon*, the mint and the arsenals went under the *vestiarion*. See also Lopez, "Silk industry."

[47] Diocletian had established a mint in each capital of a diocesis, but this correspondence was soon lost. Likewise, after Heraclius the number of mints rapidly diminished, until, in the tenth century, all minting was done in Constantinople.

There is more. If and when the law preserved by Cujas had any practical effect, we ought to notice in the coins a sudden technical improvement after a period of artistic decline due to the hiring of unskilled workers. This is exactly what happened under Heraclius. After a steady decline in quality of the Byzantine coins (ever since the time of Justinian), the reign of Heraclius witnessed a sudden renaissance.[48] Likewise, the weight of coins, which had been rapidly decreasing, was stabilized.[49] This unprecedented wonder — no debasement for more than three centuries, although the Empire went through terrible political and economic crises — did not begin with Anastasius or Justinian, but with Heraclius.[50] A new and heavier silver coin conveyed to the citizens, through its dramatic legend (*Deus adiuta Romanis*), the necessity of conquering the enemies of God and the Fatherland.[51]

We may conclude that, in all probability, Heraclius is responsible not only for authorizing amputation as the legal punish-

[48] Cf. W. Wroth, *Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine coins in the British Museum* (London, 1908), I, xxiii-xxvii. This renaissance covered gold and silver coins only. Coppers were supplied almost exclusively by the expeditious makeshift of restriking old coins. Such an anomaly can be explained only by the reduction in the staff which must have been caused by the "purge" of the college.

[49] It is a mistake to believe that the proverbial stability of Byzantine coinage began with Justinian. He resorted to debasement (Proc., *Anekd.*, 22; Malalas, p. 486, ed. Bonn; cf. Vasiliev, *Hist. de l'Emp. Byz.*, I, 211–2), and was unable to repress sub-standard private and municipal coinage of gold, at least in Egypt (cf. C. Diehl, "Une crise monétaire au VIe siècle," *Revue des études grecques*, XXXII [1919], 158–66). The crisis was aggravated under his successors: in 602, the rate of the *nomisma* in Egypt had fallen to 18 *keratia*. Copper coins had been declining as well. The *follis*, of which we have specimens struck by Anastasius at a weight of about 250–300 grains (and which had even reached a maximum of 363.8 grains in the early reign of Justinian), fell below 200 grains under Maurice, and below 100 grains at the beginning of the reign of Heraclius. Smaller denominations followed the same process (cf. also A. Segrè, "Moneta bizantina," *Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere*, LIII [1920], 311 ff.).

[50] It is particularly remarkable that no chronicler ascribed to Nicephorus I, among his numerous "κακώσεις," debasement of coins. On the other hand, the long-challenged statements of Cedrenos and Zonaras, concerning the debasement of the τεταρτηρόν by Nicephorus II, have been finally proved true by F. Dworschak, "Studien zur byzantinischen Münzwesen," *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, XXIX [1936], 73–81. Dworschak has found and described the debased *tetarteron*. This should teach us not to doubt statements of chroniclers on the sole ground that their accounts are not yet confirmed by the extant coins!

[51] Cf. Wroth, I, xxiii-xxvii and 184–254; E. Stein, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1919), p. 132–3. On the other hand, on the reverse of the African coppers of Heraclius, a Greek legend appears for the first time in the place of the Latin inscription.

ment for forgers of coins and charters, but also for issuing a complete regulation of state factories, under the supervision of the provincial governors. A fragment of this law, coming down to us thanks to Cujas, was embodied in the *Basilics*. Thus another novel of Heraclius is revealed by our investigation.

The topic of this particular essay is of limited scope; the implications, however, may be large. A fruitful field of inquiry would seem to be open in a reevaluation of the laws of the *Basilics* historically considered. Students of Roman Law in checking the *Basilics* against the *Corpus Juris* have assumed that when the *Basilics* contain provisions not in the *Corpus Juris* the *Corpus Juris* is incomplete, and they have used the *Basilics* as a supplementary source on Roman Law. It is here submitted that in doing so one may be ascribing to Justinian and Roman Law what is more properly due to Heraclius and Byzantine Law.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

MEDIEVAL IDEAS OF THE END OF THE WORLD: WEST AND EAST

By A. VASILIEV

Pagan Rome was to exist for ever. She was *Roma aeterna*, and so called by the Roman elegiac poet Tibullus as early as the first century B.C. This pagan concept, however, was unacceptable to the Christians, who were taught by their religion to expect the second Advent of Jesus Christ and the foundation of a new and eternal state on earth headed by Christ himself. Rome as an eternal city was incompatible with Christian ideas and expectations.

Nevertheless the prestige of ancient Rome was so great in the eyes of both pagans and Christians that both alike were thunderstruck and horrified when in 410 the commander of the Visigoths, Alaric, took and sacked Rome. Pagan reliance upon the eternity of the city of Rome was totally destroyed. But many Christians as well were profoundly shocked by the fall of the former capital of the Roman Empire, and they have left traces of their depression and despair in their literary works. In one of his letters Saint Jerome wrote: "I have long wished to attack the prophecies of Ezekiel and to make good the promises which I have so often given to curious readers. When, however, I began to dictate I was so confounded by the havoc wrought in the West and above all by the sack of Rome that, as the common saying has it, I forgot even my own name. Long did I remain silent knowing that it was a time to weep" (Ecclesiastes, III, 4).[1] In another letter of Jerome we read: "A dreadful rumour came from the West. Rome had been besieged and its citizens had been forced to buy their lives with gold. Then thus despoiled they had been besieged again so as to lose not their substance only but their lives. My voice sticks in my throat; and, as I dictated, sobs choke my utterance. The City

[1] Jerome's Letter 126, 2. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XXII, 1086. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, LVI (Vienna-Leipzig, 1918), p. 144. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Sec. series, VI (New York, 1893), pp. 252–253.

which had taken the whole world was itself taken." [2] In the preface to Book III of Jerome's Commentary on Ezekiel, the author writes: "Who would believe that Rome, built up by the conquest of the whole world, had collapsed, that the mother of nations had become also their tomb." [3] As far off as Egypt, in the remote monasteries of the Thebaid, a strict hermit and former Roman noble, Saint Arsenius, who lived under Theodosius the Great and his sons, could not restrain his tears when he told of the ruin of the great city of Rome.[4]

We might also recall that forty-five years later, early in June, 455, Gaiseric and his Vandals from North Africa entered Rome and for fourteen days plundered the city, and carried off to Africa much valuable booty, and the widow Eudoxia and the two daughters of Valentinian III, who had been assassinated earlier in the same year. But in 455 the concept of *Roma aeterna* had already been destroyed, so that Gaiseric's sack of Rome did not produce the powerful repercussion all over the world that Alaric's taking of the city in 410 had.

But in spite of these two heavy blows dealt to Rome in 410 and 455, Western literature from the fourth to the tenth century still contained such references to Rome as *Caput mundi* or *Aurea Roma*; the very expression *urbs aeterna*, incompatible as it is with Christian ideology, occurs in the course of the earlier Middle Ages, but this is exceptional.[5]

In 324 A.D. or at the outset of the year 325, the Emperor Constantine decided to found a new capital on the shores of the Bosphorus; the construction of the main buildings was begun immediately. Towards the spring of 330 the work had progressed so far that Constantine found it possible to dedicate the new

[2] Jerome's Letter 127, 12. Migne, *P.L.*, XXII, 1094. *Corpus Scr. Eccl. Latin.*, LVI, 154. *A Select Library* . . . VI, 257.

[3] Migne, *P.L.*, XXV, 75. *A Select Library* . . . VI, 500.

[4] *Life of Arsenius the Great*, ed. G. Tsereteli (Saint Petersburg, 1899), p. 22 (in the *Zapiski* of the Historico-Philological Faculty of the University of St. Petersburg, vol. L): Ἡνίκα δὲ καὶ ἡ Σκῆτις πρὸς τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπιδρομῆς ἠρήμωτο, συνεξῆλθε καὶ αὐτὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις πατράσιν· ἀπώλεσε, λέγων, ὁ μὲν κόσμος τὴν Ῥώμην, τὴν δε Σκῆτιν οἱ μοναχοί. Ταῦτα λέγων δάκρυά τε ἠφίει τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἰσχυρῶς ἤλγει, τῆς ἡσυχίας περικαιόμενος. See also pp. 1–2.

[5] See P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, I. *Studien* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1929), pp. 30, 37–38. Also Fedor Schneider, *Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter* (Munich, 1926), pp. 57–60.

capital officially. The dedication took place on May 11, 330, and was followed by celebrations and festivities which lasted forty days and presented a peculiar mixture of Christian and pagan ceremonies, with the balance perhaps in favor of Christianity. The new city received the name "Constantinople," the city of Constantine, and according to Constantine's original plan was to be an exact replica of ancient Rome. Constantinople became the New Rome, ἡ Νέα Ῥώμη or simply ἡ Νέα.

Byzantine literature, both secular and religious, bestows upon Constantinople an endless number of elaborate, laudatory and pompous epithets. The *Lives of the Saints* give a long list.[6] Perhaps the most magnificent and most concrete glorification of Constantinople is to be found in the unpublished *Life* of Saint Joannes (John) Akatios (Acatius) of Constantinople, some fragments of which Leo Allatius printed in his notes on the Byzantine historian of the thirteenth century, George Acropolita.[7] But so far as I know, the epithet "eternal" does not occur.

Our evidence on the foundation of Constantinople includes an interesting passage describing a religious procession on the occasion of the consecration of the new capital. The passage runs as follows: "Then the city that was called Constantinople was saluted with acclamations, when the priest cried aloud, 'Oh, Lord! Guide it well for infinite ages.' "[8] "For infinite ages" reflects the pagan idea of *Roma aeterna* though in our text the phrase is used by Christian priests.

Another very interesting indication that the new capital will

[6] Many examples of such epithets, especially from the *Lives of the Saints*, are given in a Russian book by A. P. Rudakov, *Outlines in the History of Byzantine Culture based on data from Greek Hagiography* (Moscow, 1917), pp. 110–112.

[7] Leo Allatius' fragments from the *Life of Joannes Akatius* were published in the Parisian, Venetian, and Bonn editions of George Acropolita; in the latter edition they are on pp. 205–207. In his more recent edition of George Acropolita A. Heisenberg did not reprint Allatius' notes. In the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (2 ed., Brussels, 1909, p. 117) there is a mere mention: Joannes Acatius CP. Nov. 1, with a reference to Allatius' notes; neither place nor time of the compilation of the *Life* is indicated. Rudakov (*op. cit.*, p. 112) calls him Joannes Akakios, probably a misprint. Archbishop Sergius does not mention the name of Joannes Akatius in his *Complete Menologium of the Orient* (2 ed., Vladimir, 1901).

[8] *Scriptores originum constantinopolitanarum*, ed. Th. Preger, I (Leipzig, 1901), p. 57 (§ 56): τότε εὐφημίσθη ἡ πόλις κληθεῖσα Κωνσταντινούπολις, τῶν ἱερέων βοώντων· εἰς ἀπείρους αἰῶνας εὐόδωσον ταύτην (παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικαί); ed. Bonn, *Incerti auctoris breves enarrationes chronographicae*, pp. 180–181 (in the

live to the end of the world occurs in the lengthy but extremely important *Life of Saint Andrew the Simple* (*Vita S. Andreae Sali*) who lived in the tenth century and whose *Life* was compiled by a presbyter of Saint Sophia, Nicephorus.[9] This *Life* contains a conversation between St. Andrew and his disciple Epiphanius. We read: "Epiphanius began to interrogate the Blessed One (i.e. Andrew) and said: 'Tell me, please, how and when the end of this world (shall occur)? What are the beginnings of the throes? And how will men know that (the end) is close, at the doors? By what signs will the end be indicated? And whither will pass this city, the New Jerusalem? What will happen to the holy temples standing here, to the venerated icons, the relics of the Saints, and the books? Please inform me; for I know what God said about thee and those who are like thee: It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;'[10] even more, the mysteries of this world." St. Andrew's answer to Epiphanius' question is very long. For our purposes the first lines are most interesting. They run as follows: "The Blessed One (Andrew) said: 'Concerning our city know that it will in no way be terrified by any nation till the consummation of time (*μέχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*), for no one will ever ensnare it (*παγιδεύσει*) or take it; because it has been given to the Mother of God, and no one will tear it from Her holy arms. . . .'"[11] These passages indicate Constantinople as a city destined to endure until the end of the world. Epiphanius calls it the New Jerusalem, i.e., the future celestial Jerusalem, and St. Andrew himself says that it will exist till the consummation of time.

According to the Christian conception the New Rome or Constantinople was to exist down to the Second Advent of Christ, and Constantine, its builder, would be the creator of the Roman-Christian state destined to be the last world power.[12] The idea that the Christian Roman Empire, which we call the Byzantine

---

volume *Georgii Codini Excerpta de antiquitatibus Constantinopolitanis*). See D. Lathoud, "La consécration et la dédicace de Constantinople," *Echos d'Orient*, XXIV (1925), 196.

[9] Migne, *P.G.*, CXI, 621–888.

[10] Matthew, XIII, 11.

[11] Migne, *P.G.*, CXI, 853. See Rudakov, *op. cit.*, 111.

[12] See F. Dölger, "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LVI, 1 (1937), 3, n. 1; 5; 16.

Empire, should end only with the end of the world passed later into Slavonic literature and is echoed, for example, in the interpolated Slavonic version of the so-called *Revelation of Methodius of Patara*,[13] of which we shall speak at the end of this study.

The figure 1000 had special significance in mediaeval chronology, either as the year 1000 A.D. or as 6000 or 7000 years from the creation of the world. This may be explained by the survival of the old error that the temporal reign of Christ would last one thousand years. Some passages in the Apocalypse or Revelation of Saint John the Divine, especially chapters XIX–XXII, were also interpreted as meaning that Christ was to reign one thousand years. In the second century A.D. the unknown author of the Epistle of Barnabas announced that the world would last six thousand years, as indicated by the six days of the Creation. On the seventh day, i.e., at the beginning of the seventh millennium, the Son of God would come to reign over the righteous for one thousand years. In the third century A.D. begins the decline of millenarism or chiliasm, and in the fourth century remnants of this belief are very rare. In the fifth century Saint Augustine held chiliastic illusions for a time, but finally rejected them with decision and by his authority practically put an end to that superstition. After the fifth century millenarism was unheard of except very rarely among some sects of Illuminati.[14] But a hazy tradition of the mystical significance of the year 1000 or the multiples of 1000 survived the Middle Ages and among uneducated men in some places still survives.

At the beginning of the fourth century a Christian writer, Lactantius, who died some time after 317 A.D.,[15] attached much importance to the year 6000. In his work *Divine Institutes* he wrote: "I have already shown above that when six thousand years shall be completed this change must take place, and that the last day of the final conclusion is now drawing near. . . . And al-

[13] V. Istrin, *Revelation of Methodius of Patara and apocryphical visions of Daniel in Byzantine and Slavo-Russian literature* (*Čtenija v Obščestve Istorii i Drevnostei Rossiskich*), Moscow, 1897, book II, p. 17 (in Russian).

[14] See a brief but very good article by G. Bardy, *Millénarisme*, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, X, 2 (Paris, 1928), coll. 1760–1763 (some bibliography is given). R. Janin's article "Le millénarisme et l'église grecque," *Echos d'Orient*, XXVII (1928), 201–210, deals with modern time and has no reference whatever to the Middle Ages.

[15] We have no information about Lactantius after 317 or about his death.

though they vary, and the amount of the number as reckoned by them differs considerably, yet all expectation does not exceed the limit of two hundred years. The subject itself declares that the fall and ruin of the world will shortly take place." [16] Lactantius probably based his conclusion that the year 6000 was the limit of the existence of the world upon the chronology of the Christian era used in the second and third centuries by the Christian chronicler, Sextus Julius Africanus; his era counted 5500 years from the creation of the world to the birth of Christ. Thus the year 6000 would coincide approximately with A.D. 500, two hundred years after the year 300 in which Lactantius lived and wrote. But the chronology of Sextus Julius Africanus did not come into general use. Lactantius may also have known the Epistle of Barnabas, which, as we have noted above, announced that the world would last six thousand years.

Let us consider the most important chronologies in use in Byzantium.

During the earlier Byzantine period two eras from the creation of the world, those of Panodorus and Annianus, were used. Our scanty information about these two men comes almost entirely from one source, a Byzantine chronicler, George Syncellus, who died in the early part of the ninth century. According to him, both Panodorus, "the well informed successor of (Julius Sextus) Africanus and Eusebius," [17] and his shadow Annianus, "a very bad chronologist and historian but an excellent paschalist," [18] were contemporaries and flourished under the twenty-second Patriarch of Alexandria, Theophilus.[19] Panodorus alone is mentioned by George Syncellus as living at the time of the Emperor Arcadius (395–408) and the Patriarch Theophilus.[20] Without

[16] *F. Lactantii Divinae Institutiones*, VII, 25, 3–5; rec. S. Brandt, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, XIX (1890), 664. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, XXI (Edinburgh, 1871), 481.

[17] H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, II, 1 (Leipzig, 1885), p. 189.

[18] D. Lebedev, "*Sredniki*. On the question of the origin of this Old Believers' sect," *Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction*, May, 1911, p. 114 (in Russian).

[19] Georgius Syncellus, *Chronographia*, pp. 61 and 62. Theophilus is given as the twenty-third Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 385–412, in the *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, ed. by B. Evetts, *Patrologia Orientalis*, by Graffin and Nau, I (Paris, 1907), p. 425 (161).

[20] Georgius Syncellus, p. 617. A mention of Panodorus independent of George Syncellus is to be found in Pseudo-Codinus, *Scriptores originum Constantinopoli-*

giving Panodorus' or Annianus' name, George Syncellus in another passage says that from Adam to Theophilus, twenty-second Patriarch of Alexandria, Egypt, and the two Lybias, 5904 years elapsed.[21] Panodorus lived between 395 and 408, i.e. under Arcadius. Annianus completed his work in 412, i.e., at the beginning of the reign of Theodosius II (408–450). Both were Alexandrians. A short characterization of these chronologists is also given by George Syncellus.[22] Annianus entirely depends on Panodorus. Panodorus' era began with August 29, 5494 B.C.; Annianus' with March 25, 5492 B.C.[23] Earlier Byzantine writers, for instance Maximus Confessor (in the seventh century), George Syncellus, and Theophanes (both in the ninth century), used the Alexandrian era of Annianus (*κατὰ τοὺς Ἀλεξανδρεῖς*). This era is still employed by the Copts and Abyssinians.[24]

The most important era in Byzantine history was the so-called "Byzantine" or "Roman" era (*κατὰ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους*), which Rühl calls "a chronological idea of true genius." [25] Neither its author nor the place where it originated nor the time of its compilation has yet been definitely fixed. Gelzer confidently attributes the formulation (*ausgeklügelt*) of this era to the clergy of New Rome, i.e., Constantinople.[26] Lebedev believes that the place of its origin was hardly Constantinople, but in all probability, Syria, Mesopo-

tanarum, ed. Th. Preger, II (Leipzig, 1907), p. 228, ch. 34: *καθώς φησιν Πανόδωρος ὁ Αἰγύπτιος*; *Georgii Codini Excerpta de antiquitatibus Constantinopolitanis*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1843), p. 84.

[21] Georgius Syncellus, p. 59.

[22] Georgius Syncellus, pp. 62–63.

[23] Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus*, pp. 190–191. Rühl, *Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1897), p. 191. D. Lebedev, "*Sredniki*," *Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction*, May, 1911, pp. 116–118; 121. *Idem*, "The so-called 'Byzantine' era from the creation of the world. Place and time of its origin," *Vizantiskoe Obozrenie*, III, 1–2 (Yuryev, 1917), 4–6. Both in Russian.

[24] Lebedev, "The so-called 'Byzantine' era," p. 4. G. Ostrogorsky, "Die Chronologie des Theophanes im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert," *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, VII (Athens, 1930), 1, n. 1. V. Grumel, "L'année du monde dans la Chronographie de Théophane," *Echos d'Orient*, XXXIII (1934), pp. 397–398. *Idem*, "L'année du monde dans l'ère byzantine," *ibidem*, XXXIV (1935), pp. 319–326. Apparently Grumel does not know Lebedev's study. D. Serruys, "De quelques ères usitées chez les chroniqueurs byzantins," *Revue de philologie de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, XXXI (1907), pp. 155–157. On Panodorus and Annianus see O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, vol. IV (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1924), pp. 91–93.

[25] Rühl, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

[26] Gelzer, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

tamia, or Cilicia. "To indicate exactly the city where this era was invented is impossible." [27] Schwartz thinks that the Byzantine era was already known in 525 to Dionysius Exiguus, but Lebedev refutes this.[28]

This new era was first employed in an anonymous chronicle compiled in the seventh century, *Chronicon Paschale*. The first official use of this era is found in the constitutions of the Council of 691–692, which was held in Constantinople and is known as the Quinisext (*Quinisextum*) Council. In the ninth century Theophanes knew the Byzantine or Roman era as well as the Alexandrian era of Annianus, and towards the eleventh century, the former definitely superseded the latter.

According to the Byzantine or Roman era, the first year from the creation of the world began September 1, 5509 B.C., in other words 5508 years and four months before the beginning of Dionysius Exiguus' era from the incarnation of our Lord.[29]

In Byzantine history the year 6000 after the creation, either according to Annianus' Alexandrian era, which started in 5492 B.C. or according to the Byzantine or Roman era, which began in 5508 B.C., fell within the reign of the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518): this was the year 492 according to Annianus' era and 508 according to the Byzantine era. Byzantine chroniclers and historians do not regard this year as connected with the expectation of universal catastrophe and do not emphasize it at all. Under the year 6000 Theophanes and John Malalas simply mention the construction by Anastasius of the wall against the Persians around the city of Dara in Mesopotamia.[30] The Easter Chronicle (*Chronicon Paschale*) whose anonymous author used the Byzantine era, under the year 6000 (508 A.D.) records no event whatever.[31] All later chroniclers pass over the year 6000 in silence. It may be thought that Byzantine mantic books dealing with all kinds of divination, prodigies, and omens might include some

[27] Lebedev, "The so-called 'Byzantine' era," p. 18 (in Russian).

[28] Schwartz, *Chronicon Paschale*, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, III, col. 2467. Lebedev, *op. cit.*, pp. 13–14; 18.

[29] On the Byzantine or Roman era see D. Lebedev, "The so-called 'Byzantine' era," 1–52. On p. 52 we read "End follows." But the rest of Lebedev's study never appeared, vol. III, 1–2 of *Vizantiskoe Obozrenie* being the last issue of this journal. See also D. Serruys, *loc. cit.*, pp. 179–189 (*Origine de l'ère byzantine*).

[30] Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. de Boor, 150. John Malalas, 399.

[31] *Chronicon Paschale*, 607: Ἰνδ. ιέ . ά . ὑπ' Ἀναστασίου Αὐγούστου καὶ Ῥούφου.

suggestions concerning the exceptional significance of the year 6000. In this connection there is a very interesting work *On Signs* (*De ostentis*), whose author, John Lydus, lived under Anastasius, Justin I, and Justinian the Great (490–*circa* 565). His book is filled with examples of all kinds of divination, by thunder, by lightning, by the moon. The author is extremely interested in the life of the Empire; all important political, social, and economic questions of the sixth century are treated in his book and are explained by the various signs and omens that predicted them.[32] But there is no indication whatever that the world is to end in 6000.

Two mentions of the seventh millennium appear in a little book on the origin of Constantinople, Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. This book was for long erroneously attributed to a certain Codinus who supposedly lived in the fifteenth century, but according to recent studies the anonymous author of the booklet lived at the close of the tenth century and compiled his work about the year 995 A.D. under the Emperor Basil II Bulgaroctonus (976–1025).[33] Among various monuments that stood on the Hippodrome the author mentions two statues that "give birth to wild beasts (or monsters) and devour men. One is of the tyrant Justinian and represents his acts during his second reign.[34] The other statue is that of a ship; some say that it represents Scylla who is devouring the men whom she takes from Charybdis; and there is Odysseus, whose head she holds in her hand.[35] Others say that the earth, sea, and seven millennia are being devoured by a flood; the last millennium is the seventh or current one." [36] In another place the

[32] See M. A. Andreeva, "The political and social element in Byzantino-Slavonic mantic books," *Byzantinoslavica*, II, 1 (Prague, 1930), 58; II, 2 (1930), 395; IV, 1 (1932), 73 (in Russian). See Fr. Dölger, some critical remarks in *Byz. Zeitschrift*, XXXII (1932), 404.

[33] *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, recensuit Th. Preger, II (Leipzig, 1907), praefatio, p. III.

[34] This is Justinian II Rhinotmetus, who after ten years of exile succeeded in regaining the throne in 705 and therewith began a tyrannical regime that ended in the revolution of 711 and the massacre of Justinian and his family.

[35] Cf. *Odyssey*, XII, 245 sq.

[36] *Scr. orig. Const.*, II, 190 (ch. 77): ἕτεροι δὲ λέγουσιν, ὅτι ἡ γῆ καὶ ἡ θάλασσα καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ αἰῶνές εἰσιν ἐσθιόμενοι διὰ κατακλυσμόν· ὁ περιὼν δὲ ὁ ἕβδομος οὗτος αἰών. Cf. *Georgii Codini De signis* CP, ed. Bonn, 53–54. See index to *Scr. orig. Const.*, Preger, II, 315: αἰών — spatium mille annorum. Cf. also παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικαί, in *Scr. orig. Const.*, I (Leipzig, 1901), p. 60 (ch. 61). M. Treu,

same author writes: "Anastasius Dicorus erected the church of Saint Plato at the beginning of the seventh millennium." [37] But in both these passages the fact that the seventh millennium was the current one is barely mentioned, and there is no indication whatever that people expected the world to end with the coming of that millennium. But at the beginning of the fourth century, as we have noted above, Lactantius attributed great importance to the year 6000 and stated that about this year the end of the world would take place.

If we turn to the Muhammedan world, we see that eschatological ideas had existed among the Moslems from the early time of the Arabian state. In the Koran "the day of judgment," "the day of resurrection," "the day," "the hour," "the inevitable" are repeatedly referred to; the end of the world is represented in the Koran as near at hand, as imminent, but without precise indication of its time; but later Muhammedan tradition, the so-called *Sunnah* (Sunna) is more explicit in this respect and connects the mission of the Prophet with the coming of "the hour." [38] Dadjdjal (Dajjal), a mythical personage of Muhammedan eschatology, corresponding to the Christian Antichrist, must appear towards the end of the world, either in Khurasan or in al-Kufah, or in the Jewish quarter of Isfahan (Ispahan).[39] As we know, the *Sunnah* became, next to the holy Koran, the most important Muhammedan doctrinal source, at first transmitted orally, and later during the second century of the Moslem era (*hegira*), fixed in the form of written *hadiths*. In its technical sense a *hadith* (literally "narrative") is an act or saying attributed to Muhammed or to one of his companions; many of them were fictitious, fabricated after Muhammed's death. Only in the third Moslem century were the various collections of hadiths compiled into six books which have since become standard.

The interesting point must be made that at the very beginning

---

Excerpta Anonymi Byzantini (Ohlau, 1880), p. 17. *Incerti Auctoris Breves enarrationes chronographicae*, ed. Bonn, p. 183 (under *Georgii Codini Excerpta*).

[37] *Scr. orig. Const.*, II, 232 (ch. 40): Τὸν ἅγιον Πλάτωνα ἀνήγειρεν Ἀναστάσιος ὁ Δίκορος εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ἑβδόμου αἰῶνος. Cf. *Georgii Codini De aedificiis* CP, ed. Bonn, p. 87.

[38] P. Casanova, *Mohammed et la fin du monde*, I (Paris, 1911), p. 31.

[39] See the article *Dadjdjal* in *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, vol. I, p. 909. Also Casanova, *op. cit.*, pp. 18 and 46.

the hadiths already dealt with the end of the world; probably they associated the idea of the coming of "the hour" with the taking of Yathrib-Medina by Muhammed, the aim of the first Muhammedans.[40] There was of course no question of any military expedition against Yathrib-Medina. A deputation from the city urged Muhammed to leave Mekka and invited him to make Yathrib-Medina his home. This was in the famous year 622, that of the migration of Muhammed from Mekka to Medina, the year which is frequently but incorrectly called the year of the flight (*hidjrah* in Arabic, distorted by Europeans into *hegira*, etc.). This year has become the beginning of the Muhammedan era.

Later, after their brilliant victories over the Byzantine Empire and numerous conquests in Asia and North Africa, the Arabs devoted all their energy to the taking of the capital of the Empire, Constantinople. At this time the hadiths began to substitute the name of this city for Medina. The change at the beginning was definite political propaganda directed towards the taking of Constantinople; only later did the hadiths associate the coming of Dadjdjal and the final "hour" with the fall of Constantinople. But we know that the two most important Arab attempts to take Constantinople, in 674–677 when the Emperor Constantine IV and the Umayyad Caliph Muawiyah I were reigning, and in 717–718 when the Emperor Leo III and the Caliph Sulayman (Soleiman) were on the throne, were complete failures. We must remember that among some Muhammedans of the earlier period the doctrine existed that Muhammed's mission would last one hundred years. His mission, like that of the last Prophet, could come to its close only with the end of the universe. Originally the predictions of the end of the world most probably concerned exclusively the religious field, and only later *post factum* were connected with political events to come, like the taking of Constantinople, and were adapted to specific purposes. To Muhammed himself, of course, the Byzantine capital had no connection with the "hour." The most ancient hadiths referring to Constantinople must postdate the first great expeditions of the Umayyads. One *hadith* says: "You will certainly conquer Constantinople.

[40] See M. Canard, "Les expéditions des Arabes contre Constantinople dans l'histoire et dans la légende," *Journal Asiatique*, CCVIII (1926), 108. H. Lammens, *Études sur le règne du calife Omaiyade Moawia* I (Paris, 1908), 444 = *Mélanges*

Excellent will be the emir and the army who will take it." Another *hadith* very curiously mentions both Rome and Constantinople; the latter was to fall first; Rome's turn was to come later.[41]

But the prediction of the fall of Constantinople was not fulfilled. The capital of the Byzantine Empire continued its independent existence.

"Muhammed's community passed into a new century without any catastrophe to mark the date, under the reign of the most pious Umayyad caliph Umar (Omar) II (717–720) when the directions given by Muhammed and the rights of his descendants to authority were more highly esteemed than ever before." [42] In Persia and Central Asia the people were really convinced that the domination of the Arabs was destined to last only one hundred years and they expected its end in the year 100 of the *hidjrah* (*hegira*).[43] Since Constantinople was not taken, the final "hour" had to be postponed. Exact figures for the end of the world disappeared, and the hadiths began to suggest patience to the victorious Arabs who were disappointed at being unable to take the Byzantine capital; the hadiths proclaimed that the end of the world would be preceded by the fall of Constantinople but exactly when it would happen was unknown. Perhaps "these *hadiths* were put in circulation in order to inflame the zeal of the Arabs for their raids in Romania (that is, against Byzantium). But the example of the Caliph Sulayman (Soleiman) shows how popular under the Umayyads was the enterprise against Constantinople and how much it flattered the pretensions of newly-born Arabian imperialism." [44] In this connection there is a very interesting hadith referring to Constantinople. It runs as follows: "If the world had only one day to live, God would lengthen it to permit one man of my family to bring under subjection the mountains of

---

de la Faculté Orientale de l'Université Saint-Joseph (Beyrouth), III, 1, p. 308. Yathrib is the ancient pre-Islamic name of Medina.

[41] Canard, *op. cit.*, pp. 105–106.

[42] W. Barthold, *On the history of Arabian Conquests in Central Asia, Accounts* (*Zapiski*) of the Oriental Section of the Russian Archaeological Society, XVII (1906–1907), 0146 (in Russian).

[43] Barthold, *op. cit.*, p. 0147.

[44] H. Lammens, *Études sur le règne du calife Omaiyade Moawia I* (Paris, 1908), p. 444 = *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de l'Université Saint-Joseph* (Beyrouth), III, 1, p. 308. See also M. Canard, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

Daylam and Constantinople."[45] According to some hadiths, seven years were to pass between the taking of Constantinople and the apparition of Dadjdjal. At the very moment when the Moslems were busy dividing the spoils the cry would resound, "Dadjdjal is with you." Then they would drop everything and come back to combat Dadjdjal.[46]

Referring to Byzantino-Arabian relations in the eighth century V. Barthold gives some interesting lines on the expectation of the end of the world. "The struggle between Byzantium and the Caliphate," Barthold writes, "assumed the character of a sacred war both for Christians and for Muhammedans; Christianity could not be reconciled to the loss of Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre. As to the Moslems, the existence of the world city on the Bosphorus constantly reminded them that the aim of victory for the faith as indicated in the Koran,[47] that is, the subjugation of all dissidents from Moslem power, had not been attained. Both sides were disappointed by the outcome of the struggle: the Greeks did not take Jerusalem, the Arabs failed to take Constantinople. In this frame of mind triumph changed to repentance among Christians as well as Moslems, and both expected the end of the world. It seemed to both that only just before the end of the world could their final aims be attained. In the Latin world a legend became current that before the end of the universe a Christian ruler (the Frankish king or the Byzantine emperor) would enter Jerusalem and dedicate his earthly crown to the Savior, while the Moslems expected the end of the world to be preceded by the fall of Constantinople. It is not accidental that the reign of the 'sole pious' Umayyad Caliph, Omar II (717–720), came about the year 100 of the hegira (about 720)[48] when the end of the Moslem state and also the end of the world were expected, and after the unsuccessful siege of Constantinople in the time of the preceding Caliph Sulayman (Soleiman)."[49]

The attitude of the Arabs to the expected fall of Constantinople

[45] See Canard, *op. cit.*, p. 107. The mountains of Daylam (Dailem) are in Persia south of the Caspian Sea. On "one man of my family" see Canard, p. 107, n. 3.

[46] Canard, p. 108.

[47] Koran, IX, 29: "Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Apostle have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth . . . until they pay the tax in acknowledgment of superiority and they are in a state of subjection."

[48] See above, p. 473.

[49] V. Barthold in his review of my Russian edition, *Lectures on the History of*

in the eighth century appears in a recent sprightly and popular book on *Imperial Byzantium*. "It was a fixed idea in Islam that the fall of Constantinople would mean the end of the world. Or, to put the matter more crudely, the Mohammedan belief was that if such a catastrophe were possible, then anything might happen." [50] This statement, of course, is rather too positive.

Perhaps in connection with the struggle between the Omayyad (Umayyad) Caliphate and Byzantium for the possession of Constantinople in the seventh and eighth centuries, Messianic hopes appeared among the Oriental Jews. The tremendous assault of Muawiyah on Constantinople in 672–677, though finally unsuccessful, aroused many hopes among the mystically inclined population within Oriental Jewry that the long conflict between Esau or Edom, as the Talmudists named the Roman or Byzantine Empire, and Ishmael or Ismaelites, i.e., the Muhammedans, would subsequently usher in the Messianic age. This Messianic excitement assumed active form during the reign of Abd-al-Malik (685–705) in the movement of Abu-'Isa al-Isfahani and his disciple Yudgan (Yudghan or Judah) of Hamadan, after whom the Jewish sect was named Yudganiyah (Yudghaniyah). The second great assault on Constantinople (717–718) again aroused Messianic expectations. It was sometimes hoped that the Messiah would appear in Rome, that is, New Rome, Constantinople, to witness the mutual destruction of Esau and Ishmael.[51] According to a Christian chronicler of the tenth century, Pseudo-Symeon Magister, the Jews before the Messiah expected Antichrist, who was to be born of a nun,[52] "a curious projection of his own belief in the virgin birth." [53]

Byzantium, in *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov*, I (Leningrad, 1925), 470–471 (in Russian). I have given this passage in the English and French editions of my *History of the Byzantine Empire*. English ed., I (Madison, 1928), 290; French ed., I (Paris, 1932), 315–316.

[50] Bertha Diener, *Imperial Byzantium*, translated from the German by Eden and Cedar Paul (Boston, 1938), 341. The original German edition of the book, under a pseudonym, was published in 1937. Sir Galahad, *Byzanz. Von Kaisern, Engeln und Eunuchen* (Leipzig, Vienna, 1937). There is a French translation of this work by Jacques Chipelle-Astier (Paris, 1937).

[51] Jacob Mann, *Resumé* of an unpublished study in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 47 (1927), 364. See also H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 4te verbesserte und ergänzte Auflage, V (Leipzig, 1909), 212–213.

[52] *Pseudo-Symeon Magister*, ed. Bonn, p. 669.

[53] Joshua Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire 641–1204* (Athens, 1939), p. 73.

In connection with the expected fall of Constantinople in 717–718 may be mentioned here the Messianic movement in Iraq in Mesopotamia, where about 720 a certain Christian, Serene (Serenus) made his appearance, who after adopting Judaism presented himself as Messiah or his precursor to the Jews of the region of Mardin. This Messianic expectation perhaps shows the Jewish reaction to the news that the Muhammedan conquerors were on the point of taking the very stronghold of the Christian Empire. The imminent fall of Constantinople to the Arabs might have been considered by the Jews of the period a forerunner of the Messianic era.[54] It has been assumed that this movement affected even the Jews in distant Spain, and that these Messianic expectations were clearly the cause of the persecutions decreed against the Jews in Byzantium by Leo the Isaurian.[55] But quite recently J. Starr announced that a fresh study based on additional, as well as better, texts has convinced him that there is no valid basis for supposing that the movement spread beyond Asia Minor.[56]

Let us pass now to the Christian era in use today.

The origin of our Christian era, dating from the year of the birth, or better the incarnation, of Christ, is connected with the name of Dionysius Exiguus. An abbot in Rome, in 525 he composed his *Liber de Paschate*, an Easter table; the work was written at the suggestion of Bishop Petronius, to whom the introduction was dedicated. In the introduction after mentioning that Saint Cyril had begun his chronology with the time of Diocletian and ended it with the year 247, Dionysius, continuing Cyril's work, said: "Beginning with the year 248 of that rather tyrant than emperor, we have not wanted to connect our chronology with the memory of the impious persecutor, but we have preferred to indicate the years from the incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in order that

[54] *Idem*, "Le mouvement messianique au début du VIIIe siècle," *Revue des études juives*. New series, II (CII), July–December 1937, pp. 91–92; the whole article pp. 81–92. J. Mann in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 47 (1927), 364. H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 4th ed., V (Leipzig, 1909), 169–170; note 14, pp. 457–460. Byz. sources: *Theophanes*, de Boor, 401; *Anastasii Historia Tripertita*, ed. de Boor, 260; *Cedr.*, I, 793. Byzantine sources give no name.

[55] J. Mann, *loc. cit.* J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 92. See also Graetz, *op. cit.*, V, 170.

[56] J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, p. 73.

the beginning of our hope may be clearer to us, and the cause of human reparation, *id est* the passion of Our Redeemer, may manifest itself more evidently." [57] In other words Dionysius continued and improved the Easter tables of Cyril of Alexandria; but first of all he substituted the Christian for the Diocletian era, i.e., he counted the years from the birth or incarnation of Christ, which he placed in 753 *ab urbe condita*. Dionysius died in 540.[58]

It was a long time before Dionysius' era became generally accepted. We need not be surprised, because originally his era, like other eras, was not intended to establish a general system of dates of events, but merely set the time of Easter for a number of years. The first official document that was dated by Dionysius' era was a capitulary of the major-domo Carloman in 742. At the same period this era was used in French private documents, and at the outset of the ninth century in German; it is not to be found in imperial documents before 876. The popes began to use it with John XIII (965–972), but only with the accession to the papal throne of Eugenius IV in 1431 have the years of Christ been regularly employed. These data show us clearly that about the year 1000 Dionysius' era had by no means spread all over Western Europe and was not yet in popular use. In Constantinople this era began to be used among Christians in the sixteenth century, i.e., after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, under the sultans.[59] In Russia Dionysius' era was introduced by Peter the Great in 1700. In this connection a Russian scholar and priest, D. Lebedev, writes that Peter I, who was captivated by Western influences, both good and bad, committed the very great stupidity of introducing into Russia Dionysius' poor and pitiful era in place of the excellent Roman era dating from the creation of the world.[60] In another study the same scholar says: "The calendar

[57] Dionysius Exiguus, *Liber de Paschate, praefatio*, Migne, *P.L.*, LXVII, 487.

[58] On Dionysius see A. Jülicher, *Dionysius Exiguus*, in *Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, V (1905), coll. 998–999. M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, IV, 2 (Munich, 1920), pp. 589–591. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, V (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1932), pp. 224–228.

[59] S. F. Rühl, *Chronologie der Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1897), p. 129; 197–200.

[60] D. Lebedev, "Sredniki," *Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction*, May, 1911, pp. 132–135. *Idem*, Review of A. P. Dyakonov's book on John of Ephesus, *Vizant. Vremennik*, XVIII (1911–1913), 78. Both in Russian.

reform of Peter I made no progress whatever and, from a scientific standpoint, was such another groundless concession to the West as would have been the introduction of the deformed and obsolete Gregorian calendar. The high qualities of the 'Byzantine' era are acknowledged by Western scholars who express regret that it failed to enter into general use." [61]

Dionysius' era leads us now to consider the year 1000. It has been often supposed that there was general expectation of the end of the world in this year, and that as it approached all sorts of terrors manifested themselves among the panic-stricken men of the West. The actual facts, however, are somewhat different. Let us examine our sources.

It is well known that the most important text for the description of the terrors of the year 1000 is the *History* of Raoul Glaber, who lived in the eleventh century and whose book embraces the years 900–1044. In his work we read that in various regions of different countries among uneducated and superstitious men, fear existed of the approaching year 1000. He mentions signs and prodigies, mostly of a fantastic and amusing character, and adds: "These things aforesaid befell more frequently than usual in all parts of the world about the thousandth year after the birth of Our Lord and Saviour." [62] But there is a striking difference between scattered outbreaks of apprehension of the coming end of the world and universal expectation of the last judgment. Relief and increasing activities and energy may be noted after the year 1000, especially in the field of repairing old churches and building new ones. Glaber also says: "On the threshold of the aforesaid thousandth year, some two or three years after it, it befell almost throughout the world, but especially in Italy and Gaul, that the fabrics of churches were rebuilt, although many of these were still seemly and needed no such care." [63] According to the same author, after the year 1000 had passed without catastrophe, some men began to speculate upon the thousandth year after the Pas-

[61] D. Lebedev, "The so-called 'Byzantine' era," *Vizantiskoe Obozrenie*, III, 1–2 (Yuryev, 1917), p. 3 (in Russian).

[62] Glaber, *Historiae*, II, 6, 12. *Raoul Glaber, Les cinq livres de ses histoires* (900–1044), publiées par M. Prou (Paris, 1886), p. 39. An English translation of the passage concerning the year 1000 in G. G. Coulton, *Life in the Middle Ages*. Four volumes in one (New York, 1931), p. 2.

[63] Glaber, III, 4, 13; ed. Prou, p. 62; Coulton, p. 3.

sion of Our Lord, which fell on the year 1033. In Glaber's chronicle we read: "After the manifold signs and prodigies which came to pass in the world, some earlier and some later, about the thousandth year from Our Lord's birth, it is certain that there were many careful and sagacious men who foretold other prodigies as great when the thousandth year from His Passion should draw nigh." [64] When Glaber comes to the year 1033, "that is the thousandth year from the Passion of Our Saviour," he only remarks that several most famous men and representatives of "sacred religion" died "in the Roman world" (*in Orbe Romano*).[65] But in another place Glaber gives the very interesting information that in this same year, 1033, at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem there was such a confluence of pilgrims, both noble and poor, as had never been seen before; "many of them desired to die before regaining their country." [66]

As a monk and chronicler, who lived in Gaul, Glaber had no large horizon to afford him information; he knew something about his own region, his own country, but when he mentions phenomena that occurred "in all parts of the world," his statement has no value. One conclusion only may be drawn from Glaber's chronicle, which is that, as I have already noted, in some places especially among uneducated and simple minded people some superstitious apprehension was felt and recorded.

In this respect the *Letter* of Adso de Moutier-en-Der to Queen Gerberga *On the place and time of Antichrist* is very interesting. Adso, born after 920, was elected abbot of Moutier-en-Der in 967 and abbot of S. Benigne de Dijon in 990. Some time before 980 he compiled this letter addressed to Gerberga, Queen of the Western Franks, daughter of the King of Germany, Henry I, and wife of the French King, Louis d'Outremer. Though this writing itself has no value whatever,[67] it is important as a reflection of the feeling of certain groups of people who around the year 1000 expected the coming of Antichrist, i.e., the end of the world. It is clear that Adso himself did not believe that the year

[64] Glaber, IV, 1; ed. Prou, p. 90; Coulton, p. 6.

[65] Glaber, IV, 4, 9; ed. Prou, p. 99. This passage is not to be found in Coulton's book.

[66] Glaber, IV, 6; ed. Prou, p. 106. Not translated by Coulton.

[67] See M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, II (Munich, 1923), p. 433.

1000 was the term marked by God to the world. In his *Letter* he emphasizes the fact that the time of Antichrist has not yet come, and that nobody knows when Our Lord will come for the Last Judgment. We read: "This time (of Antichrist's arrival) has not yet come, for, although we see that most of the Roman Empire was destroyed, however, as long as the kings of the Franks exist, who must hold the Roman Empire, the dignity of the Roman State shall not entirely perish, because it will stand in its kings." [68] Another passage reads: "What space of time is to elapse until the Lord comes for the Last Judgment, nobody knows; and this remains at the disposal of God, who will judge men at that hour which was fixed (by Him) for judgment centuries ago." [69] But these quotations show plainly that enough popular apprehension of the Last Judgment existed just before the year 1000 to make it necessary that the Abbot should reassure the people by proclaiming that neither the coming of Christ for the Last Judgment nor that of Antichrist, His precursor, was definitely dated. It should be mentioned that Adso compiled his *Letter* at the request of Queen Gerberga herself.[70]

The Apostle Paul in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians writes: "Be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition" (II, 2–3).

The first writer to mention the idea that the end of the world would take place immediately after the year 1000 was Cardinal Baronius at the beginning of the seventeenth century, in his Ecclesiastical Annals. He referred to the passage from the Apostle Paul quoted above and wrote under the year 1001: "A new century starts. The first year after the thousandth one begins . . . by vain assertion of some people it was announced as the last year of the world, or nearly so: in that year the man of sin, son of perdition, called Antichrist, should be revealed. This was pro-

[68] *Epistola Adsonis ad Gerbergam Reginam de Ortu et tempore Antichristi*, E. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen* (Halle, 1898), p. 110. This letter was also printed in Migne, *P.L.*, CI, 1291–1298 (among Alcuin's works). On Adso see Sackur, *Introduction*, pp. 99–104. Manitius, *op. cit.*, II, 432–440.

[69] Sackur, p. 113.

[70] Sackur, p. 113.

mulgated in Gaul (*in Galliis*), first predicted in Paris, and then proclaimed over the world; it was credited by many; indeed, the simpler ones accepted it with fear; to more educated people it seemed unacceptable."[71] Baronius' sources were two mediaeval chroniclers, Sigibert and Glaber.

In 1633 a French scholar, Le Vasseur, after paraphrasing in French Baronius' passage, which was written in Latin, and giving the same references to Sigibert and Glaber, wrote: "The year expired . . . fraud was recognized," . . . and life began again, in every field, especially in the building of new churches.[72] Both Baronius and Le Vasseur, though explicitly stating that the idea of the destruction of the world in the year 1000 or 1001 was an error and a fraud, believed that a number of people at the time were certain that the end of the world was at hand and acted accordingly.

In the eighteenth century an English historian, William Robertson (1721–1793), who made one of the first successful attempts in England at historical generalization on the basis of a vast knowledge of factual material, wrote: "The thousand years, mentioned by St. John (XX, 2, 3, 4), were supposed to be accomplished, and the end of the world to be at hand. A general consternation seized mankind; many relinquished their possessions; and, abandoning their friends and families, hurried with precipitation to the Holy Land, where they imagined that Christ would quickly appear to judge the world."[73]

It is most surprising that Voltaire in his numerous writings, if I am not mistaken, gives no description of the terrors of the year 1000. One would think that to picture the imaginary turmoil and distress of that year would have exactly suited his biting and sarcastic style. Neither in his *Essai sur les moeurs* nor in his *Dictionnaire philosophique* are the terrors of the year 1000 described. He mentions the "idea of a resurrection after ten centuries,"

[71] Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, XVI (Lucca, 1644), 410 (under 1001); ed. Barri-Ducis, XVI (1869), p. 386. The first edition came out in Rome, in 1588–1607.

[72] Jacques Le Vasseur, *Annales de l'église cathedrale de Noyon*, I (Paris, 1633), pp. 131–132.

[73] William Robertson, *The History of the reign of the Emperor Charles V. With a view of the progress of society in Europe: from the subversion of the Roman Empire to the beginning of the sixteenth century.* I used the complete work in one volume, ed. in New York (1836), p. 16.

names the sect of millenarians,[74] and quotes several times from the Annals of Baronius, to whom I have already referred as the originator of the idea of the terrors of the year 1000; but he does not deal with the year 1000 specifically.[75] In one of his minor writings, however, I have run across the following passage: "(Before the First Crusade) the opinion long spread among Christians, that the world was going to end, had, for about a hundred years, turned the faithful away from pilgrimage to Rome to pilgrimage to Jerusalem. . . . The world did not come to its close, and the Turks are masters of Jerusalem." [76]

In the thirties of the nineteenth century the French historian Michelet, with appealing literary power, gave an eloquent and most effective description of the terrors and despair of the year 1000, which greatly impressed the imagination of his numerous readers.[77] A little later another French historian, Sismondi, wrote of the medieval world that the closer it approached that fatal term, i.e., the year 1000, the more the terror of the catastrophe overpowered its imagination. "This terror kept all the faithful feeling like a condemned man whose days are numbered and whose execution is approaching. . . . The belief in the approach of the end of the world may be considered one of the elements of the important revolution that was accomplished in the eleventh century." [78] A French man of letters, Paul Lacroix, writing in the middle of the nineteenth century, declared that towards the close of the tenth century all Christendom was struck with stupor and affright. "The end of the world being at hand" were the opening words of all deeds and contracts; and the vanities of the world being forgotten in the near approach of the supreme and inevitable catastrophe, every one was anxious to start for the Holy Land, in the hope of being present at the coming of the Saviour, and of

[74] Voltaire, *Essai sur les moeurs*, ch. XXI. *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire.* Nouvelle éd. XI (Paris, 1878), p. 66.

[75] Cf. Voltaire, *Dictionnaire philosophique*, under the name *Fin du monde:* This idea of the end of our little world and of its revival struck especially the peoples subjected to the Roman Empire, in the horror of the civil wars of Caesar and Pompey. *Oeuvres complètes*, XIX (Paris, 1879), p. 142.

[76] Voltaire, *Quelques petites hardiesses de M. Clair à l'occasion d'un panégyrique de Saint Louis. Mélanges*, VII. *Oeuvres complètes*, XXVIII (Paris, 1879), p. 560.

[77] Jules Michelet, *Histoire de France*, 2d ed., II (Paris, 1835), 132–147.

[78] C. J. L. Simonde de Sismondi, *Histoire des Français*, II (Brussels, 1846), pp. 342–343.

finding there pardon for his sins, a peaceful death, and the salvation of his soul.[79]

These French writers may have been betrayed by the brilliance of their literary talent into drawing a colorful and thrilling picture of the terrors of the year 1000, without realizing that it was greatly exaggerated. But it is surprising that in 1841 a German scholar and the first serious historian of the First Crusade, H. Sybel, shared their error. He wrote: "As the first thousand years of our calendar drew to an end, in every land of Europe the people expected with certainty the destruction of the world. Some squandered their substance in riotous living, others bestowed it for the salvation of their souls on churches and convents, wailing multitudes lay by day and by night about the altars, many looked with terror, yet most with a secret hope for the conflagration of the earth and the falling of the heavens." This passage is to be found in its entirety in the second edition of Sybel's book, which was printed in 1881, and of course in the third edition in 1900, an unaltered reproduction of the second.[80]

In the second half of the nineteenth century a reaction against the "terrors" of the year 1000 manifested itself among historians. In the seventies Plaine wrote that the terrors of the year 1000 were only a myth,[81] and Rosières called them pure legend imagined probably in the sixteenth century.[82] In 1883 the German historian H. von Eicken entitled his study *The Legend of the Expectation of the Destruction of the World and of the Return of Christ in the year 1000*, though he admitted that in sporadic circles such a belief might have existed.[83] In 1885 a delightfully written book in French by J. Roy appeared, entitled *The Year 1000. Formation*

[79] Paul Lacroix, *Military and Religious Life in the Middle Ages and at the period of the Renaissance* (New York, 1874), pp. 106–107.

[80] H. Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1881), p. 150.

[81] Dom Fr. Plaine, "Les prétendues terreurs de l'an mille," *Revue des questions historiques*, XIII (1873), 164; the whole article pp. 145–164.

[82] R. Rosières, in *La Revue Bleue*, 2-e série, XIV (1878), no. 39, March 30, pp. 919–924. This article was reprinted in his *Recherches critiques sur l'histoire religieuse de la France* (Paris, 1879), pp. 135–163. *Idem*, *Histoire de la société française au moyen âge* (987–1483), 3d ed., II (Paris, 1884), p. 21, with reference to his second study just quoted.

[83] H. von Eicken, "Die Legende von der Erwartung des Weltunterganges und der Wiederkehr Christi im Jahre 1000," *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, XXIII (1883), p. 318; the whole article, pp. 303–318.

of the Legend of the Year 1000. Roy's main point is that European political life was the same before and after the year 1000. In Spain the terrors of the year 1000 failed to affect the superstitious imagination of the Arabs or to check their conquests. In France, King Robert was so little afraid of the general destruction of all things that he defied anathema. Not only did the Pope inflict upon him a penitence of seven years, but by common accord almost all the bishops of Gaul excommunicated both the King and the Queen. Thunderbolts of the church threw everywhere among the people so great a terror that many men kept away from Robert's company, and his servants regarded as defiled all the vessels from which the King ate or drank and cast into the fire the remnants from his table. The Emperor Otto III, like his famous contemporary Pope Sylvester II, believed in the duration of the world. There was not the least allusion to final catastrophe; no general fright or universal panic. The terrors of the year 1000, Roy concludes, are only a legend and myth of rather recent invention.[84] In 1887 after a careful study of sources and not overlooking Rosières' and Roy's contributions, P. Orsi concluded that Roy's results were almost identical with his own. "The terrors of the year 1000 are only a legend and a myth." [85] In 1891 E. Gebhart said that a legend had been created around the year 1000 whose historical element seems today very slight, and ended his elaborately written sketch with the following words: "It seems that Glaber lived at the bottom of the crypt of a Roman cathedral, by the glimmer of a sepulchral lamp, hearing only cries of distress and sobbing, his eye fixed on a procession of melancholy or terrible figures." [86] In 1901 the American historian, G. L. Burr, who died recently (1938), sharing of course the view of his predecessors on the legend of the year 1000, published a very clear survey of previous literature down to Orsi's study, and following A. Giry's book, whose title he does not give,[87] concluded:

[84] Jules Roy, *L'an mille. Formation de la légende de l'an mille. État de la France de l'an 950 à l'an 1050* (Paris, 1885), pp. 192–193, 194, 199, 204, 324 (Bibliothèque des merveilles publiée sous la direction de M. Ed. Charton).

[85] P. Orsi, "L'Anno Mille (Saggio di critica storica)," *Rivista Storica Italiana,* IV (1887), p. 56; the whole article, pp. 1–56.

[86] Emile Gebhart, "L'État d'âme d'un moine de l'an 1000. Le chroniqueur Raoul Glaber," *Revue des deux mondes,* October 1, 1891 (vol. CVII), pp. 600; 627–628; the whole article, pp. 600–628.

[87] A. Giry, *Manuel de diplomatique* (Paris, 1894), pp. 89–90.

"Nor may one forget that the Christian Calendar itself was yet a novel thing in the year 1000. The monk Dionysius had no authority to impose its adoption and it crept but slowly into use. Monkish chronicles had early begun to employ it; but the first pope to date by the Christian era his official letters was John XIII, scarce thirty years before the year 1000; and 'its use,' says the latest and highest authority, Arthur Giry, 'did not become general in the west of Europe till after the year 1000.' In Spain it was not used until the XIV century, and by Greek Christians not until the XV." [88] In 1908 a French writer, F. Duval, in his booklet *The Terrors of the Year 1000* reconsidered the question. Pointing out once more that our sources say nothing definite about the nearing destruction of the world in 1000, he wrote that the proximity of this year failed to stop activity or business, that the world did not tremble, and hence the conclusions concerning that period are false. "If the terrors of the year 1000," Duval says, "are a myth, who spread the legend? It is in the sixteenth century that the first mention of it appears." He refers here to Baronius and Le Vasseur. In conclusion Duval stresses his dispassionateness. "We have examined the texts without prejudice or bias. We have omitted none of them, and we do not believe that so large a collection (*un tel faisceau*) of facts in favor of the thesis that we considered, had ever before been collected." The terrors of the year 1000 are only a legend.[89] In his book *The Mediaeval Mind* (1925) H. O. Taylor dismisses the question of the year 1000 with a brief note: "For the early Middle Ages, in the decades just before and after the year one thousand, the mechanically supernatural view of any occurrence is illustrated in the five books of *Histories* of R. Glaber, an incontinent and wandering but observing monk, native of Burgundy." [90]

H. Pirenne, the famous Belgian historian, even ascribes to the tenth century the renewal of cooperative activity on the part of the people and the first symptoms of commercial renaissance. He writes: "From now on (from the tenth century), in feudal as well as in episcopal principalities, the first traces could be seen of an

[88] G. L. Burr, "The year 1000 and the antecedents of the Crusades," *American Historical Review*, VI (1900–1901), 436–437; the whole article, pp. 429–439.

[89] Fréderic Duval, *Les terreurs de l'an mille* (Paris, 1908), pp. 49; 70; 90. In his bibliography on the subject (pp. 91–92), Duval mentions neither Sybel nor Burr.

[90] H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind* (4th ed., London, 1925), I, 504, note.

organized effort to better the condition of the people. Dark though the prospect still was, the tenth century nevertheless saw in outline the picture which the eleventh century presents. The famous legend of the terrors of the year 1000 is not devoid, in this respect, of symbolic significance. It is doubtless untrue that men expected the end of the world in the year 1000. Yet the century which came in at that date is characterized, in contrast with the preceding one, by a recrudescence of activity so marked that it could pass for the vigorous and joyful awakening of a society long oppressed by a nightmare of anguish. In every demesne was to be seen the same burst of energy and, for that matter, of optimism." [91] A little later Pirenne says: "In the tenth century, the first symptoms of commercial renaissance are noted." [92] A French historian, A. Fliche, after repeating most of Pirenne's first passage, adds: "There is indeed a real renaissance about this time (the year 1000). It does not commence at the same moment in all countries; it differs in the intensity with which it affects various branches of human activity, but it touches (*effleure*) all of them and announces the beginning of a new era. To the descending curve which the Occidental world had previously followed, succeeds, here from the end of the tenth century, there at the beginning of the eleventh, an ascending curve." [93] In the revised edition of his *Guide to the Study of Medieval History*, which was published in 1931, L. J. Paetow inserted a special section, *Legend of the year 1000*, in which he gives a list of previous publications on the subject.[94] In K. S. Latourette's *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty* there is no mention of the year 1000.[95]

Perhaps it is worth mentioning that the question of the year 1000 as "the fiction of a great catastrophe" was discussed with references to previous writings in a recent American textbook on Mediaeval History. The author, E. M. Hulme, says that previous studies have dispelled all doubts as to its legendary character, and

[91] H. Pirenne, *Medieval Cities. Their origin and the revival of trade* (Princeton, 1925), pp. 79–80. Idem, *Les villes du moyen âge* (Brussels, 1927), pp. 71–72.

[92] Pirenne, *Les villes du moyen âge*, p. 96.

[93] A. Fliche, *L'Europe Occidentale de 888 à 1125* (Paris, 1930), p. 597.

[94] L. J. Paetow, *Guide to the study of medieval history* (revised ed., New York, 1931), 396.

[95] Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty, A.D. 500 to A.D. 1500* (*A History of the expansion of Christianity*, vol. II), New York, 1938.

that no such widespread and paralyzing terror afflicted the people of that time.[96]

There can be no question that the terrors of the year 1000 which supposedly overwhelmingly affected the entire European West are mere fiction. Dionysius' era at that time was not yet accepted by the masses. As we have noted above, official documents began to be dated according to this era in the middle of the eighth century, and the popes started to use it in the second half of the tenth century, not long before the year 1000. Of course here and there this era was already known by groups of people who were aware of the approach of the year 1000, and this unusual date may have aroused uneasiness, doubts, and even fear among some uneducated people and rude monks. In several places outbursts of restlessness and despair may have occurred. But these scattered manifestations are a far cry from the general hopeless and distressing situation so dramatically and effectively described by many writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

I wish to emphasize here that the most important historical figures in the West at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century were not at all apprehensive of the end of the world and paid no attention to the coming of a new millennium. In the year 1000 at Aix-la-Chapelle the Holy Roman Emperor and young enthusiast, Otto III, did not hesitate to open the tomb of Charlemagne, in which he placed the famous silk textile of Byzantine production. In the same year Pope Sylvester II, one of the most learned men of the Middle Ages, conferred upon the first Christian King of Hungary, Saint Stephen, the title of Apostolic Majesty.

Since in the Christian East Dionysius' era was not used during the Middle Ages and was first introduced only after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the year 1000 after the incarnation of Christ according to Dionysius' era was simply ignored. But we have a very interesting passage in the history of Leo the Deacon compiled just before the year 1000. He gives a detailed description of the comet that appeared in August, 975;[97] shortly after, on January 10, 976, the Emperor John Tzimisces died. Leo the

[96] E. M. Hulme, *The Middle Ages* (revised ed., New York, 1938), p. 339.

[97] Leo Diaconus, X, 6; ed. Bonn, p. 168. Leo the Deacon used the Roman or Byzantine era.

Deacon relates: "Seeing the unusual portent, the Emperor asked those who were engaged in observing the heavenly bodies what such an extraordinary phenomenon meant. They explained the appearance of the comet not as science would interpret it but according to the Emperor's desire, promising him victory against enemies and length of days. These interpreters were the Logothete and Magister Symeon and the Archbishop of Nicomedia Stephen, the wisest men among the sages of that period. But the appearance of the comet intimated not that which they explained to the Emperor to please him; (on the contrary it portended) disastrous revolts, invasions, civil wars, emigration from cities and country, famines and plagues, terrific earthquakes, and the almost utter destruction of the Roman Empire, as we have seen from subsequent events." [98]

Leo the Deacon wrote his history at the end of the tenth century, probably before 991, when the Emperor Basil II was beginning to overcome the hitherto victorious Bulgarians [99] and when a new era of Byzantine military successes and glory was inaugurated. In other words, the pessimistic and despairing picture of the situation in the Byzantine Empire which Leo the Deacon so drastically described in the passage quoted above was drawn just before the year 1000; and in the long list of various disasters that fell upon the Empire at that time, none was interpreted by Leo as foreboding the final world catastrophe.[100] On

[98] Leo Diaconus, X, 6; ed. Bonn, pp. 168–169. I give the last words of the translated passage: *καὶ πανωλεθρίαν σχεδὸν τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐπικρατείας ἅπερ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκβάσεως εἴδομεν* (p. 169). The passage was translated into Russian by V. Vasilevski, "From the history of the years 976–986," *Works*, II, 1 (St. Petersburg, 1909), pp. 56–57; into French by G. Schlumberger, *L'Epopée byzantine*, I (Paris, 1896), 768. This comet is also mentioned but without interpretation by the younger contemporary of Leo the Deacon, the Armenian historian Stephen Asokhik of Taron. According to him, the comet might have predicted the Emperor's death. *The Universal History of Stepanos of Taron surnamed Asohik*, translated into Russian by N. Emin (Moscow, 1864), p. 130. *Des Stephanos von Taron Armenische Geschichte*, III, 10, translated by H. Gelzer and A. Burckhardt (Leipzig, 1907), p. 137. *Histoire Universelle par Etienne Asolik de Taron*, III, 10, trad. et annotée par Fr. Macler. Sec. part. Book III (Paris, 1917), pp. 48–49 (*Publications de l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes*, vol. XVIII *bis*).

[99] On the question when Leo the Deacon wrote his history see M. Suzumov, "On the Sources of Leo the Deacon and Scylitzes," *Vizantiskoe Obozrenie*, II, 1 (Yuryev, 1916), pp. 136–139 (in Russian).

[100] In a recent Russian novel Leo the Deacon's passage given above is paraphrased with the addition of the following words, "perhaps foreboding the end of the

the contrary the year 1000 may be regarded as the turning point in the military history of the Byzantine Empire, when, after the repression of the revolts of Bardas Phocas and Bardas Sclerus, Basil II succeeded in winning over the Bulgarians and ended his triumphant campaigns by the annexation of Bulgaria in 1018. Plaine, whose article on the year 1000 has already been mentioned above, shows an amusing misconception on this point. "In Constantinople," Plaine writes, "the imperial dignity was very precarious; ambitious men, however, did not fail to covet it, even at the approach of the year 1000." [101]

Let us see now what the attitude was among the population of the new capital of the Byzantine Empire towards its future.

In 330 under Constantine the Great the new capital of the Empire was officially dedicated on the shores of the Bosphorus; Christian Constantinople was superimposed upon pagan Byzantium. The new Christian Byzantium had no illusions concerning her eternity. From the early times of her political existence and through the Middle Ages she was concerned about her end and was convinced that her historical life was limited and her eventual ruin certain. "Such a pessimism is rarely seen in a people," writes Ch. Diehl, "especially when it manifests itself, as is the case with the Mediaeval Greeks, at the most brilliant moment of their history, at the epoch of the great Macedonian emperors or that of the Comneni. . . . This sentiment of pessimism knew and accepted, without resisting or complaining, a limited destiny for the capital and monarchy, and stoically awaited the final day." [102]

A Byzantine legend of the twelfth century relates that after the foundation of Constantinople, according to the usage of the founders of cities, Constantine consulted the famous astrologer and mathematician, Vettius Valens,[103] as to how long the new city

---

world," A. Ladinsky, *A Dove over the Pontus* (*Golub nad Pontom*), *Tallinn* (Reval), 1938, p. 8.

[101] D. F. Plaine, "Les prétendues terreurs de l'an mille," *Revue des questions historiques*, XIII (1873), 162.

[102] Ch. Diehl, "De quelques croyances byzantines sur la fin de Constantinople," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXX (1929–1930), 192–193, 196. Cf. F. Dölger, "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LVI (1937), 3, n. 1.

[103] There were several doctors and astrologers of the name of Vettius Valens. See A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque* (Paris, 1899), p. XIII. But Vettius Valens, whose legendary prediction is connected with the founding of Constanti-

would exist. Valens cast a horoscope and prophesied that the city would last 696 years; this placed the end of Constantinople in the year 1026 (330 + 696). The Byzantine chroniclers of the twelfth century, Cedrenus, Zonaras, and Michael Glycas (Glykas),[104] who told the story, of course realized that in spite of Valens' prophecy the city was continuing to exist and prosper in the twelfth century, over a hundred years after the fatal year 1026. It is interesting to observe Zonaras' attitude on this point. He writes: "Either it is to be supposed that Valens' prediction and his science are false, or it is to be thought that he meant those years when the institutions of the Empire would be maintained, preserved, when the Senate would be honored, the citizens flourish, the imperial power law-giving; when there would be no manifest tyranny in which rulers regarded public things as their private affairs and used them for their own, not always pure, enjoyments; in which they granted public means to whomsoever they wished, treating their subjects not like shepherds who shear superfluous wool and drink milk sparingly, but like brigands who kill their own sheep and devour their meat and even squeeze out the very marrow." [105] In his chronicle Michael Glycas plainly says that Valens' prediction was false and therefore his science was proved false.[106] Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143–1180), who was fond of astrology, wrote a defense of it in the form of a *Letter* to a monk of the monastery of the Pantokrator in Constantinople, who had "disparaged astronomic science and called its study impiety." [107] In order to show that astronomy — astrology to his mind — was quite consistent with Christianity, Manuel in his *Letter* reminded the monk of the fact that Constantine, "the

---

nople, lived probably under the Antonines, in the second century A.D. See *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*, II (Brussels, 1900), 86; also I (Brussels, 1898), 79; V, pars prior (Brussels, 1904), 118. n. 2. F. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans* (New York, 1912), p. 62 (under the Antonines).

[104] Cedrenus, I, 497. Zonaras, *Epitome*, XIII, 3, 6–9; ed. Bonn, III, 14–15. Michael Glycas, *Annales*, IV; ed. Bonn, 463. See D. Lathoud, "La consécration et la dédicace de Constantinople," *Echos d'Orient*, XXIV (1925), 191.

[105] Zonaras, XIII, 3, 6–9; ed. Bonn, III, 15 . S. Diehl, "De quelques croyances," *Byz. Zeitsch.*, XXX (1929–30), 193.

[106] Michael Glycas, IV, ed. Bonn, 463. See Diehl, *ibidem*.

[107] The text of the *Letter* in the *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*, V, pars I (Brussels, 1904), pp. 108–125. On Manuel's interest in astrology and his writings on the subject see *ibidem*, 106–108.

father of the emperors and Apostle," willing to found "this our New Rome" and being anxious that the new city might remain impregnable for ever (*μέχρι παντός*) and increasing in religion, he used that science; he had asked "the wisest Valens" to draw an appropriate horoscope. "If (Constantine) had known that this science was heretical, that Christ-loving Emperor, the Apostle among Apostles and zealous follower of piety, as well as the most pious emperors who followed him and the archbishops . . . would not have used it at important moments. . . . We set ourselves against your crude and uneducated pronouncement." [108] Since Manuel of course realized that Valens' prediction had failed, he does not mention the exact figure of 696 years supposedly fixed by the famous astrologer and in his energetic defense of astrology points out Constantine's desire to see his new capital impregnable for ever; or, as Diehl says, "Some, like Manuel Comnenus, escaped the difficulty by interpreting the prediction in a broader sense and endeavoring to find in it at all costs a promise of eternity for the capital." [109]

Besides his chronicle Michael Glycas wrote *A Special Apology in reply to the writing of our powerful and holy Emperor Manuel Comnenus that was sent to a certain monk who had cast great blame upon (the Emperor) for the study of astrology, and where the latter eagerly contended to justify such a study by physical and written proofs* (*φυσικαῖς καὶ γραφικαῖς ἀποδείξεσιν*).[110] In this *Special Apology* in a lengthy and intricate passage, Glycas tells the story of Valens' supposed (*ὥς φασιν*) prediction, but concludes that since the prophecy was not realized, astrological science must be considered false.[111]

But it must be noted that the scepticism of Zonaras and Glycas failed to affect the belief of the people in general. In the twelfth century, as before, the masses continued to believe that Constantinople and the Empire would end; and they based that conviction

[108] *Cat. cod. astr. gr.*, V, 1, pp. 118–119. [109] Diehl, *op. cit.*, 193.

[110] This apology is printed in *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*, V, 1, pp. 125–140. On Glycas' writings against astrology see *ibidem*, 107–108, 140–141. See also K. Krumbacher, "Michael Glykas," *Sitzungsber. der philos.-philolog. und histor. Cl. der Akad. der Wiss. zu München*, 1894, pp. 437–438. *Idem, Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 1897, p. 384.

[111] *Ibid.*, 131–132. The exact date of the compilation of this letter is unknown. It was probably written in the last years of Manuel's reign. Manuel died in 1180. Krumbacher, "Michael Glykas," p. 438.

not only on the stars, but also, and perhaps more strongly, on the inscriptions on numerous monuments that adorned their city. Additional information on this subject may be gleaned from a source that has only recently begun to be studied, that is, Byzantine mantic books.

In a very interesting study on Byzantino-Slavonic mantic books (1930) M. A. Andreeva characterized our knowledge of these sources as "discouraging." She wrote: "Of numerous Byzantine brontologia, seismologia and lunaria nothing has been published, although enormous numbers of them are preserved in the Libraries of Western Europe and the Orient. It is sufficient to run through the catalogue of the manuscripts preserved on Mount Athos to realize this." [112] At that time Miss Andreeva was not yet acquainted with the nine volumes of the precious *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*, although they were published before the year 1930. If she had been, she would not have been so discouraged. In her later studies on the same subject she used volumes I–XI of the Catalogue (1932) and derived from them much interesting and important data.[113] According to Miss Andreeva, the mantic books or books of divination were compiled during the Hellenistic period on the basis of information from still more ancient sources. They were collected and a little modified according to the taste and political and social interests of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries A.D., and they underwent a new transformation in the seventh to twelfth centuries. This process may be summarized as the popularization and abridgment of ancient mantic books. The editors continued to compose new prognostics adapted to the political and social life of the epoch and these sometimes reflected historical facts. It is to this second epoch of the evolution of Byzantine mantic books that the composition of brontologia and seismologia falsely attributed to Heraclius and Leo the Wise belongs. The third and last stage of evolution of

[112] M. A. Andreeva, "The political and social element in Byzantine-Slavonic mantic books," *Byzantinoslavica*, II, 1 (Prague, 1930), 49 (in Russian with a French résumé). She refers here to Sp. Lambros' *Catalogue of the Greek manuscripts on Mount Athos*, I–II (Cambridge, 1895–1900).

[113] Volumes I–VIII and X of the *Catalogus* were published in 1924. If I am not mistaken, vol. IX has never come out. Vol. XI, part I was printed in 1932; XI, part II in 1934, and vol. XII in 1936. M. A. Andreeva's latest study, "On the history of Byzantino-Slavonic mantic books," came out in *Byzantinoslavica*, V (1933), 120–161.

Byzantine mantic books may be approximately dated from the outset of the thirteenth century to the end of the Byzantine Empire. During this time in addition to the types of mantic books that had existed in earlier periods some new types appeared. The prognostics added under the Palaeologi have a strongly marked social character. In addition to the brontologia based upon the Zodiac prognostics often appear according to the Calends of some month (*Calandologia*), which indicates Roman influence.[114]

Let us turn now to Constantinopolitan monuments.[114a]

To embellish the new capital Constantine and his successors removed masterpieces of art from many pagan sanctuaries and transferred them to Constantinople, which became a most wonderful museum. In the superstitious popular imagination these masterpieces, especially the statues, possessed mysterious meaning, serving as talismans that guaranteed the security of the city and particularly as presages that announced its ruin.[115] In this connection a little book on the origin of Constantinople, Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, which was quoted above, contains interesting material. Its text is full of descriptions of many Constantinopolitan monuments which, according to the interpretation of the superstitious masses of the capital, referred to its future and unavoidable ruin. Mysterious inscriptions and obscure bas-reliefs on the monuments announced the last days of the city, τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς πόλεως, τὰς ἐσχάτας ἱστορίας τῆς πόλεως.[116] On the statues of various animals which decorated the quarter of Artopolia, "hieroglyphic and astronomical" signs foretold "with names" all the future fortunes of the city.[117] On the forum of Taurus was an equestrian statue that had been brought from "Great Antioch." In the rider some identified Bellerophon, others Joshua the son of

[114] M. A. Andreeva, *loc. cit.*, V (1933), 120–131; 159–160.

[114a] A. Kirpichnikov's Russian study "Miraculous Statues in Constantinople," *Letopis* of the Historico-philological Society of the University of Novorossisk, IV, Byzantine section, II (Odessa, 1894), 23–47, fails to mention the question of the end of the world.

[115] See Ch. Diehl, "De quelques croyances," *Byz. Zeitschrift*, XXX (1929–1930), 192. *Idem*, "La société byzantine à l'époque des Comnènes," *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, VI (1929), 261; separate edition, 70.

[116] *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, recensuit Th. Preger, II (Leipzig, 1907), 176–177. See also Diehl, *loc. cit.*, p. 194.

[117] *Ibid.*, p. 175: ἱερογλυφικὰ καὶ ἀστρονομικὰ ὄντα τῶν μελλόντων δηλούσας τὰς ἱστορίας πάσας σὺν τῶν ὀνομάτων. Diehl, *loc. cit.*, p. 194 and n. 8.

Nun; but everybody agreed that the bas-reliefs sculptured on the pedestal of the statue foretold "stories of the last days of the city when the Russians should destroy Constantinople." [118] The prediction that the Russians would destroy Constantinople is very interesting. It shows that at the close of the tenth century when the *Patria* was compiled danger from Russia was stronger in the popular imagination than danger from Bulgaria. In spite of the peaceful visit of the Russian Grand Princess Olga to Constantinople in 957, the marriage of the Russian Prince Vladimir to Anna, sister of the Emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII, and the conversion of Russia to Orthodox Christianity, nevertheless the victorious attack upon Constantinople of the Russian Prince Oleg in 907 and Sviatoslav's brilliant though temporary military successes in the seventies of the same century were not yet effaced from the memory of the Empire. It should be remembered that the unsuccessful expedition of the Russian Prince Igor upon Constantinople in 941 was recorded in Byzantine mantic books, showing once more how deeply danger from Russia affected the imagination of the masses.[119] To return to other monuments in the capital. The column at Xerolophos was inscribed with the announcement of "the last destinies and captures of the city." [120] On a column in Philadelphion were bas-reliefs and inscriptions predicting the end of the Empire.[121] The four statues set up in the harbour *αἱ Σοφίαι* had inscriptions predicting the future.[122] On various statues of the Hippodrome could be read "the truth about the last destinies." [123]

Volume X of the *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*

[118] *Ibid.*, p. 176: *ἐγγεγλυμμένας ἱστορίας τῶν ἐσχάτων τῆς πόλεως, τῶν Ῥῶς τῶν μελλόντων πορθεῖν αὐτὴν τὴν πόλιν.* Diehl, *loc. cit.*, p. 195.

[119] *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*, III. *Codices Mediolanenses*, ed. A. Martini et Domenico Bassi (Brussels, 1901), p. 26, 1. 21 sq. See M. A. Andreeva, *loc. cit.*, p. 138 (in Russian).

[120] *Ibid.*, pp. 176–177: *τὰς ἐσχάτας ἱστορίας τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὰς ἁλώσεις ἔχουσιν ἐνίστορας ἐγγεγλυμμένας.* Diehl, *loc. cit.*, 195. See also *Scr. orig.*, 180, 16–18.

[121] *Ibid.*, p. 178: (*Κωνσταντῖνος*) *ἐποίησεν δὲ εἰς τὸν κίονα ἐκεῖνον ἱστορίας τὰς ἑαυτοῦ ἐνζώδους καὶ γράμματα Ῥωμαῖα τὰ ἔσχατα σημαίνοντα.* Diehl, *loc. cit.*, 194. I prefer the version of the Bonn edition (p. 44): *ἐποίει δὲ καὶ τὸν κίονα ἐκεῖνον, ἱστορίας ἔχοντα ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνζώδους, καὶ γράμματα Ῥωμαίοις τὰ ἔσχατα σημαίνοντα.*

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 184: *εἶχον δὲ γράμματα τῶν μελλόντων.* See also p. 230, 24.

[123] *Ibid.*, p. 189, 20: *ἔχωσιν τὸ ἀλάθητον τῶν ἐσχάτων.* Concerning the word *ἀλάθητον* Preger remarks: "eodem sensu ni fallor quo *τὸ ἀληθές.*" See also *Scr. orig.*, 191, 14–15: *τῶν ἐσχάτων ἡμερῶν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων εἰσὶν πᾶσαι αἱ ἱστορίαι.*

contains several predictions concerning Constantinople, which is called mostly ἡ Πόλις. Two oracles incorrectly attributed to Leo the Wise mention the coming desolation and restoration of Constantinople.[124] Some brontologia predict the strength of Constantinople, the might of its men and chiefs, and the destruction of the locusts.[125] One brontologion foretells a famine in Constantinople,[126] others joy in the capital,[127] or even great joy over the whole world.[128] A seismologion falsely attributed to the Emperor Leo the Wise prophesies distress and oppression in Constantinople.[129] One brontologion bluntly foretells the capture of Constantinople.[130] None of these examples indicates any expectation of the end of the world; many of them, indeed, are hazy and vague.

Of course all these mysterious bas-reliefs and inscriptions were obscure to the populace. Only men experienced in the art of interpreting oracles were able to understand them; and the book Πάτρια calls such men either *οἱ πεπειραμένοι* or *οἱ ἔχοντες δοκιμὴν τῶν στηλωτικῶν τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων* or *οἱ στηλωτικοὶ τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων*, who understand all these things (*ταῦτα πάντα συνιᾶσιν*).[131] It must be admitted, however, that these interpreters in spite of their experience explained the oracles only after the events had happened. The testimony of a Western historian of the Fourth Crusade and the conquest of Constantinople by the Franks in 1204, Robert de Clari, is very interesting on this point. He writes: "Still another great marvel. There were two columns. . . . On the outside of these columns there were pictured and written by prophecy all the events and all the conquests which have happened in Constantinople or which were going to happen. But no one could understand the event until it had happened, and when it had happened the people would go there and ponder over it, and

[124] *Cat. cod. astr. gr.* X. *Codices Athenienses descripsit Armandus Delatte* (Brussels, 1924), p. 27. These two oracles are printed in Migne, *P.G.*, CVII, 1129–1138 and 1149.

[125] *εἰς τὴν Πόλιν στερέωμα, ἐξουσία ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ ἀρχόντων, ἀκρίδων φθορά*, p. 61, 6–7; also pp. 130; 141.

[126] P. 61. Another brontologion (p. 131) predicts a famine and destruction of the people (*ἀπώλειαν δηλοῖ*) in Constantinople.

[127] P. 141: *εἰς τὴν Πόλιν χαρά.*

[128] P. 130: *ἐὰν βροντήσῃ . . . χαρὰ πολλὴ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ἔσται.*

[129] P. 135: *στενοχωρία καὶ θλῖψις τῇ Πόλει.*

[130] P. 141: *Ἐὰν βροντήσῃ, ἅλωσις Πόλεως.*

[131] *Ibidem*, pp. 179, 191, 206. Diehl, *loc. cit.*, p. 195.

then for the first time they would see and understand the event. And even this conquest of the French was written and pictured there and the ships in which they made the assault when the city was taken, and the Greeks were not able to understand it before it had happened, but when it had happened they went to look at these columns and ponder over it, and they found that the letters which were written on the pictured ships said that a people, short haired (*haut tondue*) and with iron swords, would come from the West to conquer Constantinople." [132] Another famous French historian and participant in the crusade, Villehardouin, wrote on the same subject: "Now hear of a great marvel! On that column from which Mourzuphles fell were images of divers kinds, wrought in the marble. And among these images was one, worked in the shape of an emperor, falling headlong; for of a long time it had been prophesied that from that column an emperor of Constantinople should be cast down. So did the semblance and the prophecy come true." [133]

The Crusaders took Constantinople twice, in 1203 and in 1204; in the latter year they not only took but mercilessly sacked the city and pillaged it of all the treasures which had been collected there for many centuries. In spite of this tragic fall of Constantinople to foreigners — the first fall in its history [134] — the world failed to end, and fifty-seven years later Constantinople became once more the capital of an empire restored though on a very reduced scale.

Recently a young Greek scholar, D. Xanalatos, referring to the fall of Constantinople to the Crusaders in 1204, wrote: "The end of the Empire was expected, i.e., according to the view of that time the end of the world as well, and we cannot be surprised that in the year 1204 the number of the defenders of the capital against the Franks was very small, so that the Frankish assailants could

[132] Robert de Clari, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. P. Lauer (Paris, 1924), p. 89 (ch. 92). *The Conquest of Constantinople*. Translated from the Old French of Robert of Clari by Edgar H. McNeal (New York, 1936), pp. 110–111. See L. Oeconomos, *La vie religieuse dans l'empire byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges* (Paris, 1918), pp. 98–100. Ch. Diehl, "De quelques croyances," *Byz. Zeitschrift*, XXX (1929–30), 195–196.

[133] Geoffroi de Ville-Hardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, éd. Natalis de Wailly (Paris, 1872), p. 133 (ch. 308). See also Robert de Clari, ed. Lauer, p. 104 (ch. 109); translation by McNeal, p. 124. See Diehl, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

[134] In 1203 the city was returned to the Greeks.

easily seize the capital." [135] This rather sweeping statement, I believe, has little solid basis, because there is no serious ground for presuming that the fear of general catastrophe before 1204 was so overwhelming that it could affect the number of the defenders of Constantinople. Moreover we have an account of the siege and capture of the city written by an eyewitness, the famous French historian Villehardouin. I give his statement here, but we must bear in mind that he may very possibly have exaggerated in order to emphasize the valour and strength of the crusading armies. He writes: "Then the Emperor Alexius issued from the city, with all his forces . . . and so many began to issue forth that it seemed as if the whole world were there assembled." [136]

One hundred and ninety-two years later, in 1453, the final catastrophe occurred. The Turks conquered Constantinople. The world still continued to exist, but the idea that it would end some time within human calculation still survived.

In later Greek literature after the fall of Constantinople the end of the world was generally expected in 1492 or sometimes in 1493–1494, which was the year 7000 from the creation of the world according to the Byzantine or Roman era. This era, as we know, counted its first year from September 1, 5509 B.C. to September 1, 5508; 5508 added to 1492 gives 7000.

On this subject the works of Gennadius Scholarius are significant. Gennadius Scholarius (his secular name was George), the last great polemist of the Byzantine church, a great scholar in theology and philosophy, and the first patriarch of Constantinople under the Turkish power, "the last Byzantine and the first Hellene," [137] was the author of a very great number of various works that were recently published in eight volumes, averaging about 530 pages each.[138] In several of his writings he deals with

[135] D. Xanalatos, *Wirtschaftliche Aufbau- und Autarkiemassnamen im 13. Jahrhundert. (Nikänisches Reich 1204–1261)*, *Leipziger Vierteljahrschrift für Südosteuropa*, III, Heft 2 (1939), 131. No references are given in this article.

[136] Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, § 177; ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 1872), p. 101; ed. Edmond Faral, I (Paris, 1938), pp. 178–179. See also the second appendix of Faral's excellent edition of Villehardouin, where he gives from various sources many interesting figures on the troops before Constantinople in 1203 (I, 221–226).

[137] C. Sathas, *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*, IV (Paris, 1883), p. VII and note 7.

[138] Among recent essays on Gennadius Scholarius, see M. Jugie, "Georges

the idea of the approaching final catastrophe. In his *Panegyric of the Holy Apostles*, written in 1456, he warns his listeners: "Behold, brethren, the form of this world has past; the fixed time for its end is at hand." [139] In his sermon at the feast of the Decollation of Saint John the Baptist, delivered in 1466, Gennadius Scholarius says: "The beginning of the second advent of Christ is clearly seen. . . . Before long, as we may well conjecture, He will return to the world in glory in order to judge and put an end to all human matters." [140] In his brief *Apology of the Antiunionists*, he writes: "The end, that is, the change of this world is at hand, as one can see from circumstances." [141] In his work on *Miracles* he says: "All signs of the end are now manifestly at work." [142] He tells more precisely of the coming end of the world in the year 7000 in his *Refutation of the Judaic Error*, written in 1464, where we read: "They said that this seventh chiliad was really already near its completion . . . and, as is stated in the Divine and Holy Scripture, it is true that the whole world of mortal and corruptible matter shall be entirely destroyed by fire." [143] In his writing on the *Second Advent of our Lord and the Resurrection of the Dead*, Gennadius Scholarius after indicating signs predicting the Last Judgment, once more emphasizes that

---

Scholarios, professeur de philosophie." *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, V (Roma, 1939), pp. 482–494. Ἀδ. Διαμαντοπούλου Γεννάδιος ὁ Σχολάριος, ὡς ἱστορικὴ πηγὴ τῶν περὶ τὴν ἅλωσιν χρόνων, Ἑλληνικά, IX (1936), 285–308. A detailed study of Gennadius Scholarius' biography, activities, and literary achievement is urgently needed.

[139] *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios* puhliées pour la première fois par L. Petit, X. A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, I (Paris, 1928), p. 184: Ἰδοὺ, ἀδελφοί, τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου παρῆλθε· ἡ προθεσμία τῆς συντελείας ἐστὶν ἐγγύς.

[140] *Oeuvres*, I, 211: τῶν δὲ προοιμίων τῆς δευτέρας τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας ἐναργῶς φαινομένων . . . μετ' ὀλίγον, ὡς εἰκάζειν ἐστὶ καλῶς, ἐνδόξως ἐπανήκειν μέλλων τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ κρίσιν καὶ τέλος τῶν ἀνθρωπείων πάντων πραγμάτων.

[141] *Oeuvres*, III (Paris, 1930), 94: Τὸ τέλος εἴτουν ἡ μεταβολὴ τοῦ δε τοῦ κόσμου ἐγγὺς, ὡς ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων ἔστιν ὁρᾶν. This text is also printed in Migne, *P.G.*, CLX, 713–732.

[142] *Oeuvres*, III, 383, 10: τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῆς καταπαύσεως νῦν ἐνεργεῖται πάντα προδήλως; see also p. 388, 14.

[143] *Ibid.*, p. 288: Τὸ μὲν οὖν τὴν ἑβδόμην χιλιάδα ταύτην εἶναι ἐγγὺς ἤδη τοῦ τελειοῦσθαι τυγχάνουσαν ἀληθῶς εἶπον ἐκεῖνοι . . . καὶ τὸ διὰ πυρὸς ἀφανισθήσεσθαι τὴν περὶ τὴν γῆν φύσιν πᾶσαν τῶν γεννητῶν καὶ φθαρτῶν παντάπασίν ἐστιν ἀληθὲς, ὡς τῇ θείᾳ καὶ ἱερᾷ Γραφῇ βεβαιούμενον. See Franz Cumont's note *De septem mundi aetatibus, Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*, IV (Brussels, 1903), 113–114; also VIII, 3 (Brussels, 1912), 199.

the world will be destroyed by the fire of a universal conflagration.[144] Among his pastoral and ascetic works, there is the *Personal Apology*, written in 1464 and addressed to his intimate friend, Theodore Branas; in it Gennadius Scholarius says that every one knows well the prophecies of the end of time.[145] A versatile theologian and scholar whose numerous works embraced almost all branches of literature, Gennadius Scholarius wrote in 1472 a brief historical essay, a curious *Chronography*, published for the first time in 1935 from his own autograph manuscript, which is preserved in Paris (*Parisinus 1289*). This very brief *Chronography*, which occupies only nine pages of printed text, goes from Adam to the year 1472 A.D. and announces the end of the world in the year 1493–1494, which, according to his computation, coincides with the end of the seventh millennium from the creation of man.[146]

We read:[147] "In all probability, indeed, the close of the seventh chiliad (millennium) will be the completion of the works of God, that is the end [148] of mortal things and the close of their activities according to divine providence. Now the completion of the seventh chiliad is drawing near and the end of the last and seventh empire; so that, indeed, very soon will begin the eighth and everlasting age and the eighth and true empire which are expected by those who are very familiar with the Scriptures, where all this matter has been explained; and with pious faith they devote themselves to the Scriptures. According to the Septuagint [149] twenty-one years from now . . . will complete the seventh chiliad; according to Joseph, twice as many, that is, forty-one. The Lord knows the future. But relying more on the record of the Septuagint and observing the signs of the end (of the world) that have already been given, we prefer of these two (periods) the shorter, that is the twentieth . . ." (here the manuscript breaks off).

[144] *Ibid.*, p. 333 (§ 3), 334–336 (§ 4).

[145] *Oeuvres*, IV (Paris, 1935), 270 (§ 5): *οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀγνοεῖ τὰ περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων καιρῶν προηγορευμένα.* On Gennadius' friend, Theodore Branas, s. p. XVI–XVII.

[146] See *Oeuvres*, IV, XXIX; the *Chronography*, pp. 504–512.

[147] *Ibid.*, pp. 511–512.

[148] In the printed text ἡ λέξις. I read ἡ λῆξις.

[149] *κατὰ μὲν τοὺς Ἑβδομήκοντα*, i.e., those seventy (or seventy-two) competent scholars who, according to tradition, translated the Old Testament into Greek in Egypt in the third century B.C.

The idea that the world would end in 1492 travelled from Byzantium to Russia, where the Byzantine era, which begins with September 1, 5509 B.C., was in general use. At the outset of the fifteenth century the Metropolitan of Moscow, Photius, wrote an encyclical letter to the Metropolitan of Kiev on the illegal ordination of Gregory Zamblak by a Lithuanian bishop; in this letter (1415–1416) he wrote that the end of time was at hand.[150] In the interpolated Slavonic version of the so-called *Revelation* of Methodius of Patara, or of Pseudo-Methodius, we discover the same idea of the end of the world in the year 7000 of the creation of the world, that is, 1492 A.D.[151]

On this subject A. V. Kartashov recently wrote: "Antichrist is at the door. The seventh millennium, which corresponds to the seventh day of the creation, is nearing its end. The beginning of the eighth millennium, the year 1492, may be in fact the end of history and beginning of the celestial reign of glory. One must be on guard against the last temptation of Antichrist. It is necessary that the Orthodox world empire should not succumb before the advent of Christ, as the last resort, as an impregnable stronghold of Holy Orthodoxy." [152] In this passage Kartashov refers to the Byzantine Empire before its final fall in 1453 but after it had unfortunately deviated from its orthodoxy at the Council of Florence (1438–1439) thereby bringing down upon itself the wrath of God. In Russia under the Grand Prince Ivan III (1462–1505) there was a very interesting religious movement known as the "heresy of the Judaizers." An important feature in the struggle between the Judaizers and their opponents was polemics concerning the end of the world, which was expected in the year 7000 (1492 A.D.). Since the world did not end in this year, the Judaizers did not fail to laugh at the Christians. At that time the question arose of a new *Paschaliya*, or schedule of dates for Easter

[150] *The Russian Historical Library*, VI (St. Petersburg, 1908). *Monuments of Old Russian Canonical Law*, part I (sec. ed.), p. 318 (in Old Russian).

[151] V. Istrin, *Revelation of Methodius of Patara and apocryphical visions of Daniel in Byzantine and Slavo-Russian literature* (*Čtenija v Obščestve Istorii i Drevnostei Rossiskich*), Moscow, 1897, book IV, p. 121 (in Old Russian). See H. Schaeder, *Moskau das Dritte Rom. Studien zur Geschichte der politischen Theorien in der slavischen Welt* (Hamburg, 1929), p. 36.

[152] A. V. Kartashov, "The conversion of Russia by the Holy Prince Vladimir and its national and cultural significance," *Vladimirsky Sbornik* (Belgrad, 1939), pp. 49–50 (in Russian).

of each year. The Church Fathers had compiled the *Paschaliya* only up to the year 7000. Under Ivan III, a new *Paschaliya* for one thousand years more or for the eighth millennium (chiliad) was compiled by the Metropolitan of Moscow, Zosima.[153] The title of his *Paschaliya* runs as follows: "The exposition of the *Paschaliya* for the eighth millennium, by the order of the Lord Great Prince Joann Vasilyevich of All Russias (compiled) by the Most Reverend Zosima, Metropolitan of All Russias: in it (i.e. in the eighth millennium) we expect the Universal Advent of Christ." [154] In the document itself, which "the new Tsar Constantine" (i.e., Ivan III) addresses "to the New City of Constantine, Moscow," we read: "The humble Zosima, Metropolitan of All Russias, has laboriously endeavored to compile the *Paschaliya* for the eighth millennium, in which we expect the Universal Advent of Christ. As to its day and hour, no one knows." [155] Since the date previously fixed for the Advent of Christ, 7000 (1492), had passed without any significant event, the Second Advent was anticipated during the eighth millennium but its date was not established. The year 8000 according to the Byzantine or Roman era corresponds to the year 2492 of our era from the incarnation of Christ. This year is too far distant to cause immediate concern. Since one thousand years is so long a time, the approach of each new century brings some superstitious uneasiness among uneducated people, the figure 100 being also rather uncommon in our current chronology. I remember that before the year 1900 signs of nervousness, uneasiness, and religious exaltation were observed in Russia in some regions, especially among the peasants, linked with the expectation that the world would end in 1900. But these scattered outbursts of superstitious awe, of course, are of no importance from a general point of view. To a certain extent they remind us of the "terrors" of the year 1000, but they are probably on an even smaller scale.

As we have emphasized above, the expectation of the final day has been connected in history not only with the approach of a

[153] See G. Vernadsky, "The Heresy of the Judaizers and Ivan III," *Speculum*, VIII (Oct., 1933), 440.

[154] *The Russian Historical Library*, VI (St. Petersburg, 1908), pp. 795–796.

[155] *Ibid.*, pp. 799–800. S. H. Schaeder, *Moskau das Dritte Rom* (Hamburg, 1929), pp. 36–37.

new millennium or a new century but also with some unusual or striking event, such as the fall of Constantinople and the destruction of the Roman or Byzantine Empire. Such superstitions survive in our own days. A few months ago the Russian Soviet newspaper *Bezbozhnik* (Atheist) related that recently mysterious preachers of the nearness of the supreme day and Last Judgment had disturbed the peace of many families of communist workers; children were distrusting their parents and paying too much attention to talks and whisperings heard in the streets on the nearness of the last day, the coming of Antichrist, and other premonitions of the end of the world.

The mediaeval history of the Near East shows that to the masses of its inhabitants, concerned as they were with predictions and expectations, Constantinople often personified the entire Empire and was the center of interest. To the overexcited imagination of the mediaeval mind, the fall of Constantinople must mean the fall of the Empire; that must mean the fall of the last world Empire to give place to a new eternal reign of Jesus Christ on earth with Constantinople as the new celestial Jerusalem. Political fluctuations during the course of the thousand years' existence of the Byzantine Empire caused the people to feel more or less apprehensively expectations of the final catastrophe. But upon Constantinople were always focussed universal attention, attraction, and admiration.

A proud modern Greek proverb adequately expresses the mediaeval attitude towards Constantinople: Ὅλος κόσμος δώδεκα κι ἡ Πόλις δεκαπέντε.[156] This proverb may be roughly translated as follows: "Twelve is to fifteen as the whole world is to Constantinople."

MADISON, WISCONSIN

[156] K. Krumbacher, "Mittelgriechische Sprichwörter," *Sitzungsber. der phil., philolog. und histor. Classe der Akad. der Wiss. zu München*, 1893, II, 253, n. 1.

A GAY CRUSADER [1]

JAMES LEA CATE

> Let us now praise famous men, and our fathers that begat us. . . . Such as did bear rule in their kingdoms and were men renowned for their power, giving counsel by their understanding. . . . Such as sought out musical tunes, and set forth verses in writing. . . . All these were honored in their generations and were a glory in their days.

This is of the Wisdom of Jesus Bar Sirach, the Ecclesiasticus of the Vulgate. It defines an attitude toward history as old as the craft itself, but one which enjoys little repute today. History has become with many of us an impersonal matter of institutions which are described with hardly a backward glance toward a more forthright age when ours was an art dealing with particular acts of particular men, and too often biography is left to the literary folk. But surely before such a group as yourselves, steeped in the tradition of medieval chroniclers and hagiographers and *jongleurs*, I may offer my simple story of a crusader with only a passing plea for indulgence.

It is not that I shall have much praise for my hero. Famous he was and renowned for power, but not for understanding. Sometimes called the "First of the Troubadors," he is now remembered for the verses he set forth, but even these were seldom honored by those clerics of his generation who have preserved his memory. In confining myself to his crusading activities I wrong him gravely,

[1] This paper was read at the dinner of the Medieval Academy of America at Chicago, December 29, 1941. The nature of the occasion for which the paper was prepared may excuse, in part, its form: I have added none of the argumentation on which generalizations have been based, and I have limited the documentation largely to references to direct quotations. The paper was not presented as a biography of William IX nor as a complete history of the Crusade of 1101. There have been many biographies, though none has been both full and critical; the crusade has received scant enough attention in the general crusading histories of Kugler, Röhricht, Bréhier, Grousset, etc., and has never, I believe, been the subject of a special work. This neglect I hope to remedy by a larger treatment, in which a juster emphasis will be given to the Lombard-Frankish army which was perhaps more important than that of the Aquitanians with which this paper is primarily concerned.

for one might as fairly damn Frederick the Great for the verses he perpetrated as this poet for his generalship. But it does no harm occasionally to remind ourselves that not all crusaders were "Iron Men and Saints," to borrow a popular title, nor were they all like that Fulcher of Chartres whom Dana C. Munro once described to this Academy as a typical crusader;[2] and indeed, from the misfortunes of my hero we may be able to learn some of the weaknesses inherent in the early crusading movement.

On October 22, 1071, a son was born to Gui-Geoffroi Guillaume, lord of Aquitaine and Poitou. The boy was first-born and was called, after the fashion of his family, William — the ninth in Aquitaine to bear that name and in Poitou the seventh. His was an illustrious lineage, numbering iron-fisted dukes who had tamed the turbulent baronage of the south, but numbering also princes like William the Pious, who had founded Cluny, and like William V, who had passed for a learned man, a collector of books who read himself to sleep of nights. By marriage the family was allied to several royal lines and the boy was own cousin to Philip I of France and the emperor Henry IV.

The mother was Audéarde of Burgundy, grand-daughter of Robert II of France. Of her character and her influence on the boy the records tell nothing, and indeed there is so little information about his formative years that a cautious historian dare not toy with those repressions, complexes, and frustrations which should illuminate the work of a modern biographer. Mother and son appear formally in a few charters; that is all. Family tradition, the state of letters in Aquitaine, and William's later literary achievements suggest that the boy may have received some formal education but we do not even know if he had any Latin.[3] In several documents he is referred to as a lad of parts, but the complimentary phrases are only the *clichés* of medieval *dictamen.*

When Gui-Geoffroi died in 1086, William was hardly fifteen.

[2] "A Crusader," *Speculum*, VII (1932), 321–35.

[3] Some familiarity with Latin has been argued from his prosody; J. W. Thompson, *The Literacy of the Laity in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1939), p. 129. The only reference to Latin in William's poems is inconclusive, since it pertains only to prayer; *Pos de chantar m'es pres talenz*, ll 23, 24, in *Les Chansons de Guillaume IX*, ed. A. Jeanroy (Paris, 1913), p. 28:

> Et ieu prec en Jesu del tron
> Et en romans et en lati.

Poitevin custom would have suggested tutelage of his mother, and it may be a token of her political ineptitude that the magnates turned instead to the dangerous expedient of investing the boy forthwith with full ducal powers. Though dangerous, this expedient was not a novel one; men matured early and died young in the Middle Ages and in some regions fifteen might be accounted legal age. When Louis VII was crowned at seventeen, Innocent II is reported to have said: "The King of France is a child, and must be educated and prevented from acquiring bad habits";[4] but for the young duke there was no Suger, no wise and loyal guardian under whose counsel he might have grown strong through early responsibility. Later Urban II wrote of having often admonished the youth to imitate his father's piety, but in spite of papal solicitude, William early fell afoul of the church. For at his accession, barons who had been cowed by the stern rule of Gui-Geoffroi turned joyously to the pastimes of their kind — private war and encroachments on ducal prerogatives and on church lands — and to purchase the support of one Eble of Châtelaillon William himself became accessory to the seizure of certain properties of La Trinité of Vendôme by that unruly vassal. Urban became interested in the case in 1094 (that was soon after abbot Geoffrey of Vendôme had loaned him 12,000 sous); first from Rome and later in Aquitaine the pope hurled anathemas at the vassal and threats at William until in 1096 the properties were restored. William's charter of restitution contains, among its legal clauses, an ingenuous apology: "When my father migrated from this world I was left, as many know, a mere boy (*satis puer*). Then my barons who should have supported me, withdrawing from my fealty, began gravely to injure me." He goes on to relate how he had sinned through lack of wisdom, "as is the wont in youthful estate, having contemned God's counsel and accepted human advice, at that time fearing more to offend man than God." [5] It was the age-old excuse of youth in trouble, here perhaps advanced with some justification; nothing vicious had yet appeared in William's character, and his charters show that he had not been ungenerous to the church. The waywardness and instability which he later exhibited may have

[4] Quoted in *Cambridge Medieval History*, V (Cambridge, 1929), 605.

[5] J. Besly, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou et ducs de Guyenne* (Paris, 1647), *Preuves*, p. 412.

stemmed in part from his lack of guidance during the troubled years of his youth, and the soubriquet *Junior* (*le Jeune*) which clung to him throughout life seems descriptive of his character as well as of his age at accession.

One common misfortune of young feudal princes, attack by bellicose neighbors, he was spared. If he was versed in family annals he might well have anticipated some passage at arms from the count of Anjou, but none came, and about 1089 Fulk le Réchin gave his daughter Ermengarde in marriage to the young duke. Ermengarde was beautiful and charming (what medieval princess was not?) but like others of her family she was a bad matrimonial risk, and within a year or two the marriage was on the rocks. Whether policy or taste dictated marriage or separation does not appear, but William did not tarry long for consolation.

In July, 1094, Sancho Ramirez of Aragon died at the siege of Huesca, leaving a young widow Philippa, daughter of William IV of Toulouse. Before the end of the year she had exchanged widow's weeds for bridal veil as spouse of William of Aquitaine. It were churlish to deny that this second bride too was beautiful, but it must be said also that she had more substantial charms. Her father had just died on pilgrimage without male issue and while his brother Raymond of St. Gilles had already succeeded to the rich countal inheritance, the daughter's claims might be pressed by an enterprising husband. William's enterprise in this respect proved greater than his crusading zeal.

In August, 1095, Urban II entered southern France and for twelve months travelled widely within that region, holding councils, settling ecclesiastical disputes, confirming grants, dedicating churches. His most important business was, however, the crusade which he inaugurated at Clermont in Auvergne. From the wake of charters and letters Urban left after him we can trace his itinerary and name his companions with a precision unusual for the period.[6] During much of his journey the pope was within William's territories, and two of the latter's most important prelates, Amat of Bordeaux and Peter of Poitiers, were in the papal entourage. Urban visited William's most important cities: he was at Clermont and Limoges and Saintes; twice he stopped in the duke's northern

[6] Given in detail in René Crozet, "Le voyage d'Urbain II en France (1095–96) et son importance au point de vue archéologique," *Annales du Midi*, XLIX (1937),

capital, Poitiers, once in the southern capital, Bordeaux. At several abbeys befriended by William's family the pope confirmed privileges, and at Montierneuf, a house founded by Gui-Geoffroi, he consecrated an altar and the church, the completion of which had been made possible by William's generosity. And "Wherever he was," says a Poitevin chronicler, "the pope ordered men to make crosses and proceed to Jerusalem and liberate it from the Turks and other nations." [7] Under these circumstances it would seem highly probable that Urban and William met and that the pope tried to enlist the young prince for the Jerusalem way by a personal appeal as well as by sermon. Indeed, some of William's modern biographers have named him as the sole great noble at Clermont and have pictured him entertaining Urban at Poitiers and Bordeaux. However likely it is that a meeting occurred, I have seen no contemporary evidence of it, and we are left with alternate possibilities: that William's name was inadvertently omitted from the numerous documents (which abound with clerics but name few lay folk), or that their silence in this respect may indicate that he consciously avoided the pontiff.[8]

42–69; "Le voyage d'Urbain II et ses négotiations avec la clergé de France, 1095–96," *Revue Historique*, CLXXIX (1937), 271–310.

[7] *Chronicon Sancti Maxentii Pictavensis*, an. 1096, in P. Marchegay and E. Mabille, eds., *Chroniques des Eglises d'Anjou* (Paris, 1869), p. 412.

[8] L. Palustre, in his "Histoire de Guillaume IX . . . d'Aquitaine," *Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de l'Ouest*, 2nd ser., III (1880/1) claims credit for first discovering William's presence at the Council of Clermont. He bases his theory on a statement in an undated letter of Geoffrey of Vendôme's (Migne, *P.L.*, CLVII, 203) which has no apparent relation to the council. A. Richard, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou* (Paris, 1903), I, 408 says that William received Urban at Clermont, but gives no citation. He was evidently following Palustre, though elsewhere (I, 500) he gives another dating to the letter. I think it highly unlikely that William attended the council. Richard says (I, 409) that William preceded Urban to Poitiers where "lui fit une réception splendide," but again gives no citation. Two chronicles of the region, both written later, assert that William invited Urban to come to Montierneuf, but neither mentions a meeting. These are: (1) *Fragmentum Historiae Monasterii — Novi Pictavensis*, by one Martin, a monk of that house; written after 1125 and published incompletely in Martène and Durand, *Thes. Nov. Anecd.*, III, 1219, 20; the section on the dedication was published in de Chergé, "Mémoire historique sur l'abbaye de Montierneuf de Poitiers," *Mém. soc. antiq. Ouest*, XI (1844), 258. (2) *Fragmenta Chronicorum Comitum Pictaviae*, in Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XII, 408; A. Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1902), I, No. 1437, dates this as late sixteenth century. Richard (I, 411) bases his assumption that William met Urban in Bordeaux on the fact that the duke issued charters in that city on March 22 and 25, 1096, and that the pope was there on May 1!

At any rate, when Urban left William's lands in May, 1096, to confer with Raymond of St. Gilles, the pope had failed to raise any important contingents in Aquitaine. William's refusal to enlist seems out of character. He was young and spirited and already a soldier of some experience, and there was a family tradition of pilgrimage and of war against the paynim in Spain. It may be that his crime against La Trinité made him ashamed to meet the pope, but his interest in the properties of that house was not particularly strong — in fact the case was soon to be settled. The real impediment was more likely to have been his wife's claims to Toulouse. Raymond of St. Gilles' early enlistment in the crusade must have won Urban's support for his cause against any claims William might advance, and the duke may have felt constrained to remain at home and profit by his neighbor's absence. It was neither a generous nor a wise choice, but it was not unique in crusading history.

Anyhow Raymond rode off to a more or less glorious career in the East, leaving his lands to his son Bertrand, and William bided with his wife and her claims. To these claims he soon gave substance. By July 1098 Toulouse was in his hands and he was subscribing documents as count of Poitou and Toulouse. His actions were not without danger. Philippa's rights may have been as good as those of Raymond and certainly a number of magnates accepted William as lord, but Urban had placed the estates of crusaders under special protection of the papacy and despoilers were threatened with excommunication. Many Christians must have felt like the bishop of Cahors, who complained in a charter that "the count of Poitou has attacked and violently seized the city of Toulouse, preparing to subjugate to himself the whole honor of count Raymond, who by order of Pope Urban . . . has gone crusading . . . to conquer heathen nations that they may no longer hold the holy city of Jerusalem." [9] But whatever papal or public displeasure there may have been, no excommunication came; William continued to rule in his wife's name, and two sons were born to him at Toulouse. The second he named Raymond; it was only common courtesy.[10] For two years William's acts are

[9] C. Devic and J. Vaissette, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, V (Toulouse, 1885), *Preuves*, col. 753.

[10] *Chron. Sancti Maxentii Pictavensis*, an. 1099; *loc. cit.*, p. 419. The elder son

but ill-attested; presumably he must have spent some time in his new territories, but he found time in 1098 to join William Rufus in an attack on their common suzerain Philip of France. It was a desultory and bootless campaign of the sort common to feudal warfare; its causes and its issues are long forgotten, and it brought William nothing but an evil and dangerous associate. Then in 1099 or 1100 occurred a change in William IX's policy toward the crusade that inaugurates the central theme in our story.

Urban II had not ceased to work for the crusade after the departure of the armies in 1096. He had written to north Italian cities, urging their participation, and in several councils — at Rome and Chieta in 1097, at Bari in 1098, and at Rome again in 1099 — he had continued to push crusading business. Well-informed by letters of the progress of the armies, he realized the need of additional manpower, and even before the crusaders reached their goal he was planning a new expedition, perhaps even considering seriously the invitation of the crusading chiefs to come out and assume command himself. But this new Moses was denied even a glimpse of the Promised Land, for he died a fortnight after the capture of Jerusalem without hearing of that triumph.

The news came soon after, first by official letters and then by word of mouth of returning pilgrims who tarried not long after fulfilling their vows, and the reports spread with a rapidity and thoroughness unusual in that age. Hardly a chronicle, however jejune and parochial its outlook, but what records the victory of the church militant, and often enough you will find a scribe dating a charter not only by the incarnation, indiction, epact, concurrent, pontifical and regnal year, and all those redundant phrases which are the trade secrets of diplomatics, but also by some such clause as "in the year when Jerusalem was besieged and captured by our Christians." [11] You have only to recall the return of the A.E.F. in 1919 to picture the reception the heroes met, the tales they told, and the trophies they exhibited. There was no note of disillusion-

was later William X of Aquitaine (1126–37), father of the celebrated Eleanor. Raymond was later (1136–49) prince of Antioch. It is not clear whether the two sons were born in the same calendar year, or whether Raymond was born when William IX again held Toulouse in 1114.

[11] *Cartulaires de l'église cathédrale de Grenoble*, ed. J. Marion (Paris, 1869), B, no. II.

ment such as followed later crusades. Christendom exulted in its achievement and even sluggish knights were stirred. There must have been many like that Henry of Grandpré, a notorious vexer of the church at Verdun, who "having heard of the wondrous deeds done by Godfrey and his comrades for Jerusalem, planned a second expedition to follow them and came to Verdun and there took the cross." [12]

There was still glory to be won. The land was but half-conquered and the return of the great majority of crusaders left but a few hundred men to complete the task. Letters from the East, however triumphant in tone, were urgent in their appeal for recruits. Thus when Paschal II ascended the throne of St. Peter in August 1099, he inherited a situation calling for a new crusade, a Europe more favorably inclined than in 1095, a plan already partly formulated, and a well-proven technique for implementing the plan. Trained in the court of Gregory VII and of Urban II, Paschal was dedicated to the new crusade by the dead hand as in a later century Honorius III was committed to the Fifth Crusade by the plan of Innocent III.

So Paschal wrote encouragingly to the crusaders in the East and turned to the task of raising a new army. He could hope for no aid from the monarchs of the West: Philip of France was living in open sin with the wife of a vassal; Henry IV was excommunicate; the king of England anxiously waited the return of a wronged crusading brother, and the Spanish kings had been enjoined to do their Saracen hunting at home. The new army must be led by feudal lords and must be raised from regions which had been little stirred in 1096, and from the laggards of the earlier movement. Paschal sent an encyclical to the prelates of France, ordering them to preach the crusade and to press with renewed threats of excommunication for the departure of the many who had earlier taken the cross but who had never gone to Jerusalem, and ordering also that returning crusaders should have seizin of all rightful properties. To implement these commands, a synod was held at Anse in the Lyonnaise; the crusade was preached and Paschal's threats of excommunication were published.

Then the pope sent two legates into William IX's territories; they were at Limoges and then at Poitiers where they convoked a

[12] *Laurentii Gesta Episcoporum Virdunensium*, *M.G.H.*, *SS.*, X, 497.

council on November 18, 1100, fifth anniversary of Urban's council at Clermont. A large number of French prelates attended. They settled a number of ecclesiastical quarrels, enacted new canons and reaffirmed those of Clermont, and passed on to what had become routine church agenda — excommunication of King Philip for adultery. The several accounts of the meeting are not wholly in agreement as to the actual circumstances, but it seems that William IX was present at one session; that he objected violently to the anathema against his sovereign; that some ill-bred layman precipitated a riot by heaving a rock at the legates; and that order was restored only by the firmness of a few courageous prelates. One account reports a speech of William's filled with sentiments of feudal loyalty ill-matched with his recent attack on his suzerain;[13] another interprets his actions as those of one whose marital status was as bad as Philip's.[14] But they indicate a quick repentance by the duke, and a penance imposed by the legates. In these accounts, no word of the crusade, which may have been obscured by the melodrama and the special interests of the narrators. The *Chronicle of St. Maixent* reports, under 1100, that William took the cross at Limoges, and then passes to a brief account of the events at Poitiers.[15] But one other account, that of Geoffrey of Châlard, must be considered; its author was an eyewitness, and since he is called "Blessed," his testimony should be good. He says that the legates came to Limoges and thence to Poitiers, where "they celebrated a council, violently exciting the people that they should quickly aid the faithful in God's war. In this council *I was present* when William of Aquitaine and other counts and leaders and innumerable flocks of the faithful . . . assumed the sign of Christ's cross." [16]

The exact site of William's public enlistment can have little interest for us save as it touches on his motives. Two reasons have been advanced for his action: that the crusade was a penance assigned by the legates for his disorderly conduct at the council; and that he was forced to go by threat of excommunica-

[13] *Vita B. Hilarii,* in Bouquet, *Recueil,* XIV, 108.

[14] *Vita B. Bernardi Abbatis de Tironio, ibid.,* p. 166.

[15] *Loc. cit.,* p. 420.

[16] *Beati Gaufridi, Castaliensis prioris. Dictamen de primordiis ecclesiae Castalienses. Recueil des historiens des croisades, historiens occidenteaux,* V, 348. Hereinafter references to this set are abbreviated *R.H.C.*

tion for his seizure of Raymond's lands. There is a suggestion in William's own verses that he went as a penitent, but so did all others, and these specific reasons seem not wholly probable. He had already arranged to finance his expedition by mortgaging his patrimony to William Rufus, who hoped to engulf Aquitaine as he already had Normandy. Negotiations had been ended only by the death of the English king on August 2, 1100, so it is evident that William IX's plans had been maturing months before the affair at Poitiers. As for Toulouse, it does not appear that William had ever been personally censured by Urban or Paschal, and a blanket threat was but a soft rod to his sort; after all, his was a legalistic age and he did have an actionable claim. Be that as it may, by the early months of 1100 Bertrand was again ruling the Toulousain. Later English chroniclers, not wholly unpartisan, say that William mortgaged that territory to Bertrand to finance his crusade.[17] This story may contain a kernel of truth. Nowhere is there a hint of sudden repentance by William, nor of a successful attack by Bertrand. William was well supplied with funds on his crusade yet we hear of no other loans, and it is quite possible that he relinquished claims to Toulouse in return for a lump sum. Perhaps modern interpretations have been too subtle; contemporaries give no hint of papal threats for either of his alleged crimes, and they do indicate that William was caught in the wave of general enthusiasm. When one chronicler says that the duke, wishing "to exhibit his prowess and extend his fame, collected a great army of his subjects," [18] he may well have given the real clue to William's crusading interest.

Certainly that was the spirit in which many enlisted. True, the church put special pressure on slackers, of whom there were many. Men who had taken the cross but had remained at home, or had quitted the armies in Italy or elsewhere, or worst of all, those

[17] Robert de Torigni, *Chronica*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard* (R.S.; London, 1889), IV, 202; William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, II, x; *ibid.*, I, 121, 2. These passages are concerned with Henry II's expedition against Toulouse in 1159, and both authors attempt to justify Henry's claims through Eleanor of Aquitaine. It has been suggested that William IX may have raised some funds by the granting of municipal privileges; E. Audoin, ed., *Recueil de documents concernant la commune et la ville de Poitiers* (Poitiers, 1923), I, intro., p. xxxiii. Most of the 12th-century sources indicate that his expedition was amply provided with funds.

[18] *Ex Historiae Francicae Fragmento*, Bouquet, *Recueil*, XII, 6.

"rope-dancers" who had fled from Antioch — these were loudly denounced and were threatened. Public sentiment was often more potent than fear of excommunication in moving notorious deserters like Hugh of Vermandois, or like Stephen of Blois, whose spirited wife, unable to face her neighbors, nagged her husband until he went back to an eastern grave. Still Ekkehard's statement that the armies consisted principally of those whose vows had been hindered by fear or diffidence, poverty or weakness, must have been exaggerated.[19] There was an enthusiastic response from regions which had contributed little to the First Crusade — from Aquitaine and Burgundy, Lombardy and Germany, where the propaganda techniques of 1096 were repeated. Popular preachers like Robert d'Arbrissel and Raoul Ardent may have spread the enthusiasm in Poitou, and the recruiting was sped by a fine lot of prodigies in Germany, and by a proper display of holy relics in many regions.[20]

Of the size of the armies we know nothing — or too much. Figures are given, but with that gay insouciance characteristic of medieval chroniclers and of official communiqués from Tokyo. If we accept the repeated statement of the soberer accounts that in size this new expedition was not inferior to that of 1096, we have a comparative if not an absolute estimate. What boded ill for its success was the fact that, in spite of the advice of the leaders in the Holy Land, there was a large proportion of non-combatants, of clerics and of women.

Information concerning the Crusade of 1101 is fragmentary.

[19] Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolymita*, c. XXII, 3; ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Tübingen, 1877), pp. 223, 4. All other references to this work are to this edition.

[20] Robert d'Arbrissel, founder of Fontevrault, had so impressed Urban II with his eloquence at Angers in 1096 that the pope had commissioned him apostolic preacher. He was an active participant at the Council of Poitiers in 1100; see J. de Petigny, "Robert d'Arbrissel et Geoffroi de Vendôme," *Bib. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 3rd Ser., XV (1854), 1–30. Raoul Ardent, a learned and eloquent orator, was attached to the court of William IX and is said to have accompanied him on crusade. He is supposed to have written a crusading history but whether of that of 1096 or 1101 is not clear; *Hist. litt. de la France*, IX, 254–65. These men then were closely associated with crusading figures and were among the most celebrated preachers of their time, but so far as I know there is no direct evidence that they preached the crusade.

For the prodigies, see Ekkehard, *Hierosolymita*, c. XXII, 1, 2, pp. 221–3. For relics, see *Sigeberti Gemblacensis Chronica, Auctorium Aquicenense*, *M.G.H.*, *SS.*, VI, 395; and especially *Chron. S. Maxentii, loc. cit.*, pp. 416, 419.

From local chronicles we know the names of many participants, and their fate; from charters we can learn something of the financing: how, for instance, Harpin of Bourges sold his city to Philip I, or how one Chatardus made gift of his lands to Savigny for 250 sous and a mule.[21] Several historians of the First Crusade give brief narratives of this later expedition, but there is no eye-witness account comparable to those of the Anonymous or Fulcher of Chartres. History, we are often reminded, is written by the survivors; these were not many in the Crusade of 1101, nor was there much to be proud of. The historian Ekkehard of Aura was a witness of part of the events, but his account is disappointingly meager. The fullest account is that of Albert of Aachen, and Albert, in spite of his partial rehabilitation is still not wholly respectable. Nevertheless I am inclined to value his evidence highly in general, if not always in detail.[22]

None of these accounts has described the general strategy of the crusade, but Paschal's plan seems to have been modelled

[21] M. Prou, ed., *Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier* (Paris, 1908), Nos. CXLV and CXLVI, and p. 368, n. 1; *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Savigny*, ed. A. Bernard (Paris, 1853), No. 867.

[22] Of the western historians who wrote accounts of the First Crusade, the following give some treatment to the Crusade of 1101: Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913); Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, in *R.H.C., Occ.*, IV; Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. A. Le Prevost, IV (Paris, 1852); William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. Wm. Stubbs (R.S.; London, 1889); Raoul of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, in *R.H.C., Occ.*, III; William of Tyre, *Belli Sacri Historia*, in *R.H.C., Occ.*, I. The minor historians and the continuators add little to these accounts.

Ekkehard of Aura was an original source for the journey of one German band as far as Constantinople; after that he depended on reports from refugees from defeated armies. His account consists only of half a dozen short chapters. The account in Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolymitana* (*R.H.C., Occ.*, IV) is much longer, constituting all of Bk. VIII and about one-fourth of Bk. IX. He speaks of getting some of his materials from survivors, but we do not know the source of most of his details. Albert's account of this crusade was attacked as erroneous and inconsistent by H. von Sybel, but defended (effectively, I think, in the main) by B. Kugler, *Albert von Aachen* (Stuttgart, 1885), pp. 309–24.

Many local sources give details about the various contingents. For the Aquitanians, the most useful are: *Chronica Prioratus de Casa Vicecomitis* and *Chronicon S. Maxentii Pictavensis*, both in Marchegay and Mabille, *Chroniques des églises d'Anjou; Gesta Ambaziensium Dominorum*, in L. Halphen and R. Poupardin, *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou* (Paris, 1913); and *Narratio Floriacensis de Captio Antiocha et Hierosolyma*, *R.H.C., Occ.*, V.

Of the non-Latin sources, the most useful are: Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, *R.H.C., Hist. Grecs*, I, ii; Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique*, *R.H.C., Doc. Armeniens*, I; and Ibn-Alatyr, *Kamel Altevarykh*, *R.H.C., Hist. Orient.*, I.

closely after that of 1096. Hugh de Die, ambitious archbishop of Lyons who had taken the cross in 1096 but had failed to leave, had renewed his vows at Anse and Paschal had offered him a legateship in the East, perhaps intending him for the role earlier played by Ademar of Puy; but we hear nothing more of him until he turns up in 1102 at Jerusalem. It was left to the several bands of recruits to find their way to Constantinople as best they might, and making their rendezvous there, to march in a single body across Asia Minor and Syria. It becomes necessary then to follow each band separately for a while.

The Lombards went first, in September, 1100.[23] Led by Anselm, archbishop of Milan and many lay nobles, they marched through Carinthia and Hungary, wintered in Bulgaria, and reached Constantinople in early spring. The new armies constituted as much of a problem for the emperor Alexius as had those of 1096. The Lombards had been a scourge in Bulgaria and encamped in the suburbs of Constantinople they became a positive menace. For two months they awaited the arrival of other bands, but after much rioting and one serious attack on the Greeks, they were forced to cross over to Nicomedia late in April. There they were joined by new contingents, some Germans under the constable Conrad and a large army of West Franks led by Stephen of Blois and Odo of Burgundy. Prudence would have suggested waiting for other reinforcements known to be en route, but the armies, rash and impatient, soon departed. Raymond of St. Gilles had recently returned to Constantinople to treat with Alexius, and at the urgent request of the crusaders, Raymond and a troop of Turcopoles were sent along as guides. Raymond and Stephen of Blois, experienced campaigners, wished to follow the route of the First Crusade, but the unruly Lombards insisted on turning northward into Khorasan in a wild scheme to rescue the captive Bohemund. Of their disastrous journey Albert gives a detailed account, but we need say only that after suffering from privation and constant attack from Turkish cavalry, the army was cut to pieces near

[23] Albert of Aachen gives a very full account of this expedition. Accounts other than those listed above may be found in Cafaro, *Liberatio Civitatum Orientis*, *R.H.C.*, *Occ.*, V; in Landulphus de S. Paulo, *Historia Mediolanensis*, L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, V, iii (new ed.: Bologna, 1934); and a brief note in *Catalogus Archiepiscoporum Mediolensium*, *M.G.H.*, *SS.*, VIII.

Amasia early in August. Many leaders escaped to Sinope and thence to Constantinople, but few of the lesser folk survived.

Albert of Aachen tells of a second Frankish army, led by William of Nevers, which left in early spring of 1101, marched through Italy, crossed from Brindisi to Valona, and thence went overland to Constantinople where they arrived during the first half of June. Their conduct along the way had been admirably disciplined, and Alexius received them graciously, but after three days he ferried them over the straits. There they camped for a fortnight, and after June 23 set out in a vain attempt to overtake the Lombards, changed their plans at Ancyra and turned toward Iconium. Harassed by the same Turks who had defeated the Lombards, weakened by hunger and thirst, the Christians were finally annihilated near Eregli; only William and a handful of leaders escaped. Albert's account of this separate expedition under William of Nevers is not substantiated by other sources and the chronology of its march is hard to fit into the general picture, but the story is very circumstantial, and I am inclined to credit it in a general way.[24] At any rate, the fate of the earlier armies presaged and to some extent determined the fate of the Aquitanians.

William IX had completed his preparations in the winter of 1100–1101. His large army included Herbert, vicomte of Thouars, Geoffrey, count of Vendôme, Hugh of Lusignan, half-brother of Raymond of St. Gilles, Hugh of Vermandois, and other barons. William's forces included also many clerics of all ranks, and many women of varying degrees of honesty. Some leaders took their wives, but William left his Philippa to manage his estates, which she seems to have done well enough. It was not that William had full confidence in that lure of beautiful Greek women which is said to have been part of Alexius' propaganda; being in this one respect a provident man he took with him a bevy of charming girls.[25] His going was not without the pious donations appropriate

[24] Several accounts speak of William of Nevers as participating in the crusade, and there is supporting evidence in a number of charters. But Ekkehard and Matthew of Edessa speak of only *two* armies marching through Asia Minor, and some have thought that William of Nevers joined the Aquitanians at Constantinople (Hagenmeyer in his ed. of Ekkehard, p. 240, n. 5). But see also Kugler, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

[25] Guibert of Nogent is responsible for these details; *Gesta Dei per Francos*, I, v and VII, xxiii; in *R.C.H., Occ.*, IV, 133 and 243.

to the occasion, and there is a touching picture in one charter of the duke's giving to St. Jean d'Angely an old female serf, and kissing her before the assembled monks in token of his affection. His departure was also the occasion of the only poem of William's which is useful to us.[26] It is a plaint lamenting the beautiful land he was leaving, the gaiety, the silks and the robes furred with vair and gris; and lamenting most of all the little son he left at the mercy of rapacious neighbors. Of dangers to land and heir, who could have been more aware than the despoiler of Toulouse? At any rate, it is a song of a reluctant pilgrim rather than of a stalwart athlete of Christ; but we must remember that William was a poet and we must not forget his bevy of girls.

The host left the Limousin on March 13. They joined, according to plan, various German contingents under the leadership of Welf IV of Bavaria and Countess Ida of Austria, and together they went through Bulgaria. Discipline was bad, and because of their pillaging the crusaders were dogged by Patzinak and Cuman mercenaries of Alexius. The westerners were allowed to buy provisions at market towns, but not to enter in force, and when they found their way into Adrianople barred, the Aquitanians in their wilful pride fired the suburbs and attacked the defenders. There were casualties on either side, including a kinsman of William's, but a peace was patched up, markets opened, and the Bulgarians furnished an escort to the capital. The vanguard, in which Ekkehard seems to have marched, reached Constantinople about June 1, but it took fifteen days for all the troops to assemble. These dates are hard to reconcile with Albert's account of William of Nevers, for his army should have been at Constantinople during that fortnight, but unless Albert's circumstantial account is wholly wrong, the two forces must have failed to meet. Whatever resentment Alexius may have felt for the attack on Adrianople he hid, receiving William IX and his fellow leaders as "sons" (a ceremony which apparently had some symbolic importance), lavishing gifts on them and exacting from them the customary oath of fealty. The armies remained in the environs of Constantinople for five weeks, the leaders alone being allowed to enter the city to confer with Alexius. Several chroniclers speak of William's haughty mien toward the emperor, and Matthew of Edessa says that "though

[26] The poem *Pos de chantar m'es pres talenz*, cited in note 3 above.

the count was only a young man of twenty or so, he spoke with sovereign hauteur to Alexius, according him not the title of emperor but only of eparch." [27] This over-long sojourn allowed the crusaders to purchase supplies for the journey, but it became the occasion of vague fears of impending treachery. The crusaders could not yet have heard of Lombard disasters, but in panic many Germans forsook the army and sailed for Tarsus. Ekkehard, evidently considering that his duty was to write history rather than make it, was among this group. The others were finally forced by Alexius to cross the Hellespont, and near harvest time (perhaps late July) they set out with a guide of Turcopoles. Electing the route of the First Crusade, they passed through Nicomedia and Nicaea, and thence turned toward Iconium. Their provisions, originally plentiful, eventually began to fail. The Turks, adept at the scorched earth policy, burned the ripe crops and destroyed water supplies, and the Christians suffered greatly. They took two towns, Philomelia and Ismil, by-passed Iconium, and pushed on toward Eregli. There the crusaders expected to slake their thirst in the river, but even as they drank they were attacked by a large Turkish army. This included the combined forces of the sultan Kilidj Arslan, and of the emirs Malik Ghazi, Karadscha of Harran, and Ridwan of Aleppo; it was the same army which had recently defeated the other Christians, and their blunted swords, says a chronicler, were still warm with Lombard blood. Pouring a hail of arrows over the stream, the Turks crossed and assailed the Christians. Weakened by famine and thirst, relaxed and off-guard and probably dismounted, caught in a narrow and swampy valley, the crusaders were doomed. Small bands resisted, but the army as such dissolved and was cut up in detail. The slaughter was terrible; a few escaped, but most of the warriors were killed, and the women were either massacred or carried off into slavery as age or beauty might dictate. Welf of Bavaria and William of Aquitaine were among the fugitives. A chronicler pictures William seated on a little hill at the end of the day like Xerxes at Salamis and weeping at the destruction of his army.[28] With a single squire he made his way to Longinath near Tarsus, and was honorably received by the Frankish governor, Bernard the Stranger. Tan-

[27] *Chronique*, II, xxii, *R.H.C., Doc. Armen.*, I, 59.
[28] *Ibid.*, II, xxiii, p. 60.

cred, ruling Antioch during Bohemund's captivity, heard of William's misfortunes, sent for him, and refitted him handsomely.

William stayed the winter out at Antioch and during that time other fugitives apeared, coming directly from Asia Minor or by boat from Constantinople: several bishops, William of Nevers, Welf, Stephen, Odo of Burgundy, Harpin of Bourges, Raymond of St. Gilles, and other nobles, but few footsoldiers and no women. It was like the governor of Kentucky's army, this gathering — all colonels and generals and no privates, and it did more credit to the quality of the horses of the magnates than to their courage, but there was still opportunity for redeeming reputations. In February 1102 they resumed their march toward Jerusalem. Tancred had tried to imprison Raymond of St. Gilles, an old enemy, on the charge of having betrayed the Lombards to the Turks, but the survivors themselves insisted on Raymond's release, and he marched with them, with never a hint of ill-feeling toward William for the seizure of Toulouse. Aided by a Venetian fleet the crusaders captured Tortosa after a short siege, and left the city to Raymond of St. Gilles. Near Beirut the pilgrims were met by King Baldwin, who conducted them to Jerusalem. There they passed Holy Week, witnessed the seasonal miracle of the Holy Fire, and celebrated Easter in great state.

This marked the fulfillment of vows, and most of the crusaders turned homeward without further thought of aid to the hard-pressed Christian state. Many pilgrims embarked from Jaffa but their ill luck continued; they were forced back into port by a storm just in time to participate in the disastrous battle of Ramla, where a number were killed. William IX was at Jerusalem Easter, but of his activities thereafter we are ill-informed. Apparently he was not at Ramla. Some say he returned to Tancred's court and sailed from Antioch in the fall; others that he sailed with his fellows from Jaffa in the spring and made a successful voyage; and this story seems more likely since William was back in Poitiers by October 29, 1102.

With William's checkered career thereafter we need not be concerned; has not Aristotle, *the* philosopher of William's age, taught us that unity lies not in the whole story of a man's life, but only in a series of related incidents? William lived to bring more trouble to his church, his suzerain, his neighbors, and many hus-

bands — even to make second attacks against Toulouse and against the Muslim; but we may avoid those activities to muse over his crusading venture.

The Crusade of 1101 had failed dismally; few of its participants had reached Jerusalem, fewer still had returned; the aid rendered the new Christian kingdom was negligible. The failure of this expedition stood out lividly against the background of the recent successes of the earlier expedition, and chroniclers who observed the divergent fates of armies similar in size turned inevitably to a supernatural explanation: God had miraculously blessed the First Crusade and had allowed the other to be destroyed because of its manifold sins. Shorn of eschatological implications, this charge refers to the disorderly conduct of ill-disciplined bands. More specifically, the chroniclers (save Albert) assert that the armies of 1101 were betrayed to the Turks by Alexius and his agent Raymond of St. Gilles. Of these explanations, the first is only partially true, the second wholly false. Fortunately it is no longer necessary to defend Alexius' name. We realize now that all western accounts of the early crusades were colored by the perennial suspicion of the Latin for the Greek, and that all histories of the Crusade of 1101 were written after Bohemund's successful campaign to blacken the emperor's character in the west. Alexius can have had little love for the western barbarians; their presence in 1101 constituted a menace to the safety of his city and their behavior gave a foretaste of what was to come in 1204. But he was, in Gibbon's phrase, "patient and artful." Dissembling his natural resentment at insults and injuries, he treated the leaders more gently than they deserved, trying to win from them oaths of fealty for lands to be conquered. His insistence that the armies cross to the Asiatic shore was merely a prudential measure, not an attempt to force them into Turkish territory. Far from sending the crusaders to their doom, Alexius had pleaded with them to follow the only practicable route, that of the First Crusade, and the destruction of the Lombards had come because of their refusal to heed his advice. The emperor stood to gain something by Christian victories, nothing by a Turkish revival, and nothing by the rescue of his arch-enemy Bohemund. The same argument from policy would exculpate Raymond of St. Gilles, and indeed his alleged victims themselves swore to his innocence when Tancred had preferred his libelous charges.

There can be little question that the various contingents, save that of William of Nevers, were lacking in discipline. They antagonized fellow-Christians along the route by their marauding, and frightened Alexius by their violence in Constantinople; the Lombard army was lax in its behavior even during the march through Turkish territory; and the Aquitanian host was destroyed in an ambush that precaution might have averted. Those same faults in varying degree had not been absent during the First Crusade, and they had had a cumulative effect. For repeated threats to Greek security had made Alexius loath to allow any crusading army to remain long in Constantinople, and hence the plan for a general meeting there in 1101 was never carried out. The tragedy was that the margin of error was so narrow, a matter of days; the chance factor, always important in war, was against the crusaders. Had the German, Aquitanian, and Nivernais contingents been a few days less on the march, the several groups would have united at Constantinople and might have won through to Syria. In 1097 the disunion had been in the ranks of the Turks, and the crusaders had never faced a united Seljuk front. In 1101 the Turkish emirs had for the time stilled their quarrels and joining their forces, they defeated in three swift campaigns the separate columns of Christians. This Seljuk union too was, to the crusaders, a chance occurrence, or at least one which could not have been foreseen.

These chance factors were peculiar to the Crusade of 1101, but there were serious military difficulties inherent in the general situation and hence common to all the early crusades. Europe's warfare for centuries had consisted primarily of neighborhood feuds, and it now entered with little preparation a war calling for large scale international organization. There was no unified command and cooperation between the various contingents was difficult. Financing was largely by individuals with some extra aid from the great leaders; provisioning methods were inadequate. The proportion of noncombatants was inordinately large, yet was inevitably so, for the papacy had to rely on mass enthusiasm for its recruits and the fiery sermon which stirred the doughty knight might move as well the pious monk, the discontented peasant, and the bored wife. We are apt to overlook what the crusader never lost sight of — that he was still a pilgrim for all his arms; whether man-at-arms or non-effective he was called *peregrinus*, and the

celerity with which he turned homeward once he had worshipped at the Holy Sepulcher shows how unlike was his status to that of the modern soldier.

The objective lay two thousand miles from France. The easiest part of the march was through strange Catholic lands, half-friendly at best, and through territories of the hated Greek schismatic; the inevitable halt at Constantinople was fraught with danger. The long trek across Asia Minor was even more formidable. Without any base of supplies, the crusaders were forced to rely on what provisions they could carry; much of the land was barren and rugged and the armies had to accommodate themselves to the slow pace of the noncombatants and of the transport carts made the more numerous by their presence. Of the geography of Asia Minor the westerners were painfully ignorant, except, one may believe from Guibert of Nogent, as they remembered New Testament place-names,[29] and they were dependent upon unreliable guides. Their journey exposed a long open flank to an enemy conversant with every road and by-way, highly mobile, expert in guerilla warfare and in elusive battle tactics which resemble, in contemporary descriptions, the attacks of American Indians as portrayed in the old silent movies. The Christians were unable to feed their horses well, and they were seldom able to manoeuvre the Turks into a position permitting the knights to capitalize on their heavy shock power. Against Turkish mounted archers they had no effective missile weapons, no dependable infantry. And hence the remarkable similarity in the narratives of the early crusades: for each of the bands from Peter the Hermit's to Frederick Barbarossa's there is a regular pattern which ends, except in the case of the First Crusade, with disaster in Asia Minor. Small wonder that the chroniclers saw in the feats of Godfrey and Bohemund a manifest sign of God's will.

When Odo of Deuil wrote his history of the Second Crusade he went into considerable detail in describing the itinerary and the difficulties encountered: "For," he says, "pilgrims to the Holy Sepulcher will never be lacking, and they will, I hope, be more cautious because of our experiences." [30] But that was a vain hope.

[29] *Gesta Dei per Francos*, VII, xxiv, *loc. cit.*, pp. 243, 4.

[30] Odo de Deuil, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, Bk. II, in Migne, *P.L.*, CLXXXV, col. 1212. Odo reiterates this purpose in several places; cf. col.

Franks who remained in the East quickly adapted their tactics to the new environment, but western Europe learned but slowly from its costly mistakes. Urban himself seems to have recognized the importance of sea-power; Christian navies early established an effective control over Mediterranean sea-lanes, and from 1098 Italian ships assisted in amphibian operations and provided speedy and direct transportation to the Levant. From the beginning of the twelfth century small bands of recruits regularly sailed for Syrian ports, but Richard the Lion Heart was the first commander of a major army to elect that simpler and safer route. Perhaps leaders clung to the land route from sheer military conservatism, perhaps because of the unwieldy size of their pilgrim bands, but in any event, no one of the great land armies after 1099 arrived intact in Syria.

You will pardon, I hope, this lapse into the currently popular role of the parlor strategist and my neglect of William IX. To what extent his generalship contributed to the defeat of his army it is hard to say. Contemporaries praise his military qualities, but those qualities must have been limited to the physical courage common to his class. The few specific references to his personal activities on crusade are to deeds of a rash knight rather than of a prudent general. Certainly he lacked good luck, which military critics as unlike as Napoleon and Sir Archibald Wavell have named as a prime necessity for the general. Geoffrey of Vigeois explains William's failure curtly: "Duke William of Aquitaine went to Jerusalem along with many others, yet he wrought little for the Christian name; for indeed he was a hot lover of women (*vehemens amator foeminarum*) and therefore manifestly inconstant in his works." [31] This explanation is too simple, and the general assumption on which it rests seems badly supported by the reputation of many great generals. But there is no evidence that William had any real qualities of leadership, and indeed, what impressed his age most was a levity of character unbecoming to his station. The details with which this light-heartedness is documented may be suspect, but the general impression given by

---

1211. There is a better edition and a translation of this work, as yet unpublished, in Virginia Gingerick, *Odo of Deuil's "De Profectione Ludovici VII"* (University of Chicago Ph.D. Dissertation; 1941).

[31] *Chronicon*, in Bouquet, *Recueil*, XII, 430.

a number of apochryphal stories is substantiated by his actions and by his own verse.

Orderic Vitalis says that William "was bold and brave and exceedingly jocose, surpassing even comic actors in his numerous jokes." [32] William of Malmesbury calls him a giddy buffoon, and reports that after his return from Jerusalem "he resumed his drolleries, seasoning his jests with a certain false charm which distended the mouths of his audience in loud guffaws." [33] Happily, few of his jokes have survived. Real humor is timeless, but mere wit is dependent on too much that is local and ephemeral, and I suspect that William's best stories would fall as flat today as do most medieval *facetiae*. There remains one *bon mot* of his about a bald-headed bishop which must have been hoary even in the twelfth century, and a nonsense rhyme that depends for its humor on incongruities of a sort highly appreciated in kindergarten today. The practical jokes of which he is accused are not of a kindergarten type: how he planned to found a little nunnery at Niort and fill its offices with famous prostitutes; or how he rode about the countryside with a picture of a vassal's wife, his mistress, on his shield and an obscene explanatory jest on his lips.[34] If the crusaders of 1101 relieved the tedium of their long march by telling stories, William's contributions must have been like to those of Chaucer's Miller than to those of his Knight — something of the sort of joke which Mark Twain said you could follow in its passage down a pilgrim procession "by the blushes of the mules in its wake." The moral tone of William's jokes had less to do with his generalship than the mere vice of joking. A sense of humor is a valuable asset to the morale of common soldiers, but it might be hard to name a great general (save perhaps Suvorov) who was a wag. Perhaps what William lacked was the deadly seriousness of purpose, the will to win which had characterized Bohemund.

One would like to know what effect the impact of Byzantine and Arab civilization had on William. My own guess is that few of the transient pilgrims received much in the way of intellectual

[32] *Historia Ecclesiastica*, X, xix; ed. A. Le Prevost (Paris, 1852), IV, 118.

[33] *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, V, sect. 439 (R.S.; London, 1889), II, 510.

[34] The poem, *Farai un vers de dreyt nien*, may be found in Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, pp. 6–8; the other details are from William of Malmesbury as cited in note 33.

stimulus or content, but that is a prejudiced judgment based only on the negative evidence of some eyewitness accounts of the crusades and on the profound ignorance of France displayed by our veterans of World War I. The disaster at Eregli furnished materials for a very lively *Passio* describing the martyrdom of Bishop Thiemo of Salzburg, and for the story of how Ida of Austria was carried off by a Turkish leader and bore to him a son who became the famous emir Zengi.[35] This latter was perhaps the earliest example of what became a popular *genre*, yet both of these tales were cast in conventional literary forms and show little influence of the East. But William's was a cultivated spirit, and it were unthinkable that he was untouched by Byzance and Antioch and Jerusalem. One of his contemporaries reports that "he wallowed in the sty of vice as wholly as though he believed that all things were governed by chance instead of by Providence," and Etienne de Bourbon has a story about a count of Poitiers (usually identified with William) which reflects a shockingly materialistic outlook.[36] Taken together, these references may suggest that the duke was affected with what the Middle Ages called Epicureanism, and one may speculate as to whether he picked up his dangerous ideas in the East or in Languedoc, soon to be notorious for its heresy.

But his poems, as I painfully construe them, give no hint of serious thought. They show, I am told by my literary friends, great technical skill in prosody, but to a philistine the reiterated theme of romantic love is tiresome and the treatment both artificial and licentious. One lost poem we may regret. Orderic says of William that after his return, being witty and jocose of temperament, he often described his misfortunes in rhymed verse, set to merry tunes and delivered before kings and fellow nobles.[37] These verses might have told us something more than the bare details of military disaster, might have enlightened us as to the

[35] Several versions of the *Passio S. Thiemonis* are given in *R.H.C.*, *Occ.*, V, 203–23; and see Riant, "Le martyre de Thiemo de Salzbourg," *Rev. Quest. Hist.*, XXXIX (1886), 218–37. For one version of Ida's story, see *Historia Welforum Weingartensis*, *M.G.H.*, *SS.*, XXI, 462.

[36] William of Malmesbury, as cited in note 33; *Anecdotes historiques . . . d'Étienne de Bourbon*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris, 1877), No. 478, p. 411.

[37] *Hist. Eccl.*, X, xx; *loc. cit.*, p. 132. Orderic speaks incorrectly here of William's captivity.

effects of the journey on an impressionable spirit. But they are gone and we are left to conjecture.

Yet we may believe that the Crusade of 1101 affected men in divers ways. Harpin of Bourges entered Cluni to live out his years in thanks for a miraculous escape; William of Nevers learned enough to refuse to go on the Second Crusade; only William of Aquitaine seems to have got any fun from the fiasco. Certainly he derived no spiritual improvement; this at least is what the chroniclers said with their stories, what the church said with its anathemas, and what even his ardent admirer, the anonymous thirteenth century biographer of the troubadors, said with his epitaph:

> The count of Poitiers was one of the most courteous men in the world and a great tricker of women; and a good knight-at-arms, and a great one to make love. Well he knew how to make verses and well to chant, and longtime he went through the world to fool the ladies.[38]

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[38] C. Chabaneau, ed., "Biographies des Troubadors," in Devic and Vaissette, *op. cit.*, X, 213.

THE HISTORICAL ELEMENT IN WESTERN AND EASTERN EPICS

DIGENIS — SAYYID-BATTAL — DAT-EL-HEMMA [1] — ANTAR — *CHANSON DE ROLAND*

By Henri Grégoire

It is only natural to try to apply the few concrete results of our research in the field of Byzantine and Arabo-Turkish epic to another epic question, about which the opinions of the greatest and seemingly best equipped scholars still widely differ, I mean the famous *Chanson de Roland.*

The use of the comparative method seems fully legitimate because of the strikingly similar conditions in which that epic arose and grew.

Its starting point beautifully coincides chronologically with the period in which both the Byzantine hero and his counterpart, the Moslem martyr, fought and fell: Sayyid-Battal, the historical Sayyid-Battal in 740, Digenis in 788.

Likewise, the end of the evolution of the Moslem epic material can be dated about 1100. Both in the Turkish story and in the Arab romance of chivalry, the last historical characters which we can identify are persons who appeared on the stage of history during the last years of the eleventh century and at the beginning of the twelfth.

The Byzantine Emperors who are named in connection with the Moslem fighters all belong to that period, and to that period only. And not only their names, but also their deeds correspond with the actual role of the historical rulers who bear their names.

For instance, during the fourth and fifth part of the Arab Romance, the Byzantine Emperors are named Michael, Armanous, Alfalougos, a second Michael, Milas. In the Turkish Sayyid-Battal, we find other names: Takfour and Kanatous and also Asator.

[1] We shall also use the shorter form of that title, viz. Del-Hemma.

Most of these names are perfectly clear, and one can hardly say even that they are distorted: Armanous, for example, the most warlike of these Byzantine Emperors who, after a long series of victories and defeats, twice loses his throne and twice recovers it, to be finally strangled by Alfalougos, is evidently Emperor Romanos Diogenes who, like Armanous, is once taken prisoner by the Moslems. Michael reminds us of Michael Doukas. As to Falougos, his identity with Palæologos had been recognized by Professor Canard. But the French scholar had been puzzled by the name of the great Byzantine dynasty of the XIIIth and XIVth centuries.

Now it suffices to open at random the Byzantine historians of the end of the eleventh century to discover that our Falougos-Palæologos is simply the brother-in-law of Alexios Comnenos, who fought against the Turks in Asia Minor, like his father, who helped Alexios conquer Constantinople and was so active against Robert Guiscard in 1081.

It is not astonishing that, in a confused period so full of usurpers, — Nikephoros Botaniates, Nikephoros Bryennios, Nikephoros Melissenos, some of whom may or may not be looked upon as regular Emperors, — the Arabs should have given the imperial title to powerful generals closely related to the legitimate Emperor, or confused them with the reigning Basileus.

Alfalougos is possibly confused with actual Emperors. When he is spoken of as the son of the Emperor and of the daughter of the King of Georgia, one is reminded of the fact that his brother-in-law, Alexios Comnenos, had been made the adoptive son of Empress Maria, who actually was a Georgian Princess; and when he orders poor Armanous to be strangled, he seems to be confused with Emperor Michael Doukas.

Again, the Del-Hemma speaks of a Moslem called Ghilan "qui passe avec toute sa troupe au camp de l'Empereur où il acquiert une haute situation. Ghilan devient le véritable chef de l'armée byzantine."

This applies to the famous traitor so often mentioned under different names in the Oriental and Byzantine sources. The Byzantines (Bryennios) call him "Chrysoskoulos" or "Chrysokoulos" (and possibly -Koulos Ghilan).[2]

[2] For the Byzantine sources, see the article on the battle of Manzikert by Sauvaget

All this refers us to the same period. Another characteristic name is Bahilak, evidently Basilakis, the famous usurper and adversary of Alexios Comnenos; cf. in the Del-Hemma: "L'Empereur ayant été blessé dans un combat singulier contre Bahilak." [3] Here again, there may be a confusion, for another Basilakis played a doubtful role at Mantzikert.

A still more convincing identification is that of Asator, mentioned by the Sayyid-Battal Romance as being a Byzantine Emperor; we have shown that he was not, but only the most faithful supporter of Romanos Diogenes, the Armenian Khatchatour, commander of the Byzantine troops in Cilicia. This identification has been universally accepted.

As to Takfour, it is simply the Armenian word for Emperor, but it spread everywhere and was accepted by the Turks as an Armenian title or name because of the great many Emperors or would-be Emperors then called Nikephoros.

Finally, *Milas*, the name of the very last Byzantine Emperor in the Del-Hemma, is *Melissenos*, Nikephoros Melissenos, generally overlooked as a Byzantine Emperor, but who had been proclaimed as such by his troops, recognized as such by part of the Turks, and even acknowledged by Alexios Comnenos.

In the Sayyid-Battal, it is not Milas but Kanatous who appears as the last Byzantine Emperor. If his name were not transparent by itself, his deeds would compel us to recognize him. Kanatous succeeds in seizing the throne, thanks to the help of the Turks, to whom he does not remain faithful, for he attacks them with the help of the Frank Serdjail and the Frank Oudj, unmistakably the Crusaders Raymond de Saint Gilles and Hugues de Vermandois, both very famous from 1096 to 1100. The result is that Kanatous, who is bold enough to seize again the offensive against

---

in *Byzantion*. I am quoting from C. Cahen's article, "La bataille de Mantzikert d'après les sources orientales," *Byzantion*, IX (1934), 613–642. Mr. Cahen writes about the Turkish refugee (pp. 625–626): "Un chef de la trihu turcomane des Naukya, le beau-frère du sultan Arisiaghi, ou Arisigi. . . ." These two forms of the name are read in different Mss. of the Arab historian Sibt. "Matthieu d'Edesse appelle le personnage Guédrij, forme qui peut résulter de l'interversion de deux mots composants." Cahen thinks of Χρυσόσκουλος, the form used by Bryennios.

[3] For the Del-Hemma, I refer to M. Canard, "Le Delhemma," *Byzantion*, X (1935). My article on Khatchatour, bearing the title "Héros épiques inconnus," appeared in the *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales* II (1934), 451–463.

the Moslems, must be the "restitutor Imperii," *Alexios Comnenos.*

Comnenos is a difficult name subject to many distortions, and, as a matter of fact, almost always distorted, even in Occidental sources (Coninos). But Kanatous at least beautifully and regularly preserves the Greek accent. In modern Turkish, every oxytone Greek word still ends in -ous. Cf. καρπός, karpuz. . . . And as to the change of the last -n to -t, one must not forget that one more dot on the same Arab letter automatically brings it about. So far as Saint-Gilles is concerned, we find him also in the Del-Hemma, under Falougos: "l'on voit intervenir notamment un Roi Franc nommé Shamkhoulis" (cf. Sangelis of the Byzantines).

If all this onomastic material is not sufficient, we shall point to a character called *Bimont*, who once ousts Emperor Armanous. But this Bimont treats the Moslems with such ferocity that the best Arab fighters unite their forces against him. Bimont is naturally Bohemond, so famous in the whole East since his father's war in Epirus in the year 1081.

Most of our identifications are borne out by a partly parallel text which has never been adduced until the present day; it is simply the once too famous Antar Romance which, a century ago, was universally looked upon as the greatest and grandest of epics *überhaupt.*

The star of our romantic poetry, Lamartine, admired it more than Homer and, in spite of the tremendous dimensions of that "magnum opus," many attempts were made in different countries to translate it completely, but all these attempts failed. Even the English translation, which is the longest, contains hardly one third of the whole.

It is one of the scandals of Oriental philology that the Antar Romance, "mehr gelobt als gelesen," remains a kind of virgin soil. Even the best Italian arabist, Nallino, is astonishingly non-committal about the fundamental questions: "L'unica notizia sicura è che, già alla metà del secolo XII di Cristo, il Romanzo godeva di grande popolarità nell'Oriente arabo (Siria e Mesopotamia), popolarità che, almeno in Egitto ed in Siria, si mantenne fino a tutto il secolo XIX. Manca finora uno studio critico dell'opera; la più ampia delle parziali traduzioni Europee e quella di T. Hamilton."

Nevertheless, I think that even a perfunctory perusal, I shall not say of the published "résumés" of the book, but of the only

reliable study of it, that of Bernhard Heller, will enable us to fix, just as in the case of the Dat-el-Hemma and Sayyid-Battal, the date of the latest historical allusions or interpolations.

Antar himself is naturally the pre-islamic poet, but the Romance as we have it clearly represents the conclusion of an evolution of his legend and its spirit is the spirit of the Crusades. But it does not breathe Turkish ferocity like the Sayyid or Dat-el-Hemma. Its atmosphere is more chivalrous. It was conceived and written in Syria or Palestine under the Crusaders and aims at a kind of reconciliation of the two races. In that respect, it is nearer to Digenis than to its two other Moslem counterparts. I am speaking naturally of the last edition, not of the Ur-Antar (says Heller: "Die Umrisse des Ur-Antars lassen sich mit philologischer Wahrscheinlichkeit entwerfen nach dem Schwanengesang in welchem Antar auf sein Leben zurückblickt").

The adventures which are not included in that swan-song belong to the last period; and among them we see the diverse amorous exploits of the Arab hero twice begetting our own Godefroid de Bouillon, for the latter knight appears under two forms: Ghandafar and Kontofre (the Greek transcription).

This *procédé* is exactly that which the author of Digenis uses in order to link together his hero and the Moslem heroes, namely *'Amr*.

Mr. Heller seems to believe that the time-limit is late in the twelfth century. But I think that nothing can be found in the Antar Romance, which could not belong to the end of the eleventh nor the beginning of the XIIth century.

What is Antar's last exploit? He kills . . . Bohemond, and rescues Rome besieged by the latter. He does that as an ally of the Byzantine Emperor, as an ally of the King of Rome called Balkâm. One remembers that the killing of Bohemond, the greatest enemy of both the Byzantines and the Moslems, was mentioned also in the Del-Hemma, where it is said to be the merit of Del-Hemma herself. It is an epic law that the supreme victory over the national enemy "number" one must be kept in store for the greatest hero of the "geste." In the German epic, it is always the insuperable Dietrich von Berne or Theodoric of Verona who survives all other champions.

Antar, the Arab knight par excellence, saves Byzantium and

Rome and kills the great Norman Bohemond. This is certainly a direct echo of the alliance of the Byzantine Empire with Moslem states and princes in their fight against the Normans. And if we had the slightest doubt about that, that doubt would be suppressed by the very names of the relatives of Bohemond: Mubert, Subert, Kubert. History is so vaguely known to philologists that even Heller has not seen the truth: "hier haben wir es mit einer Gruppe von Namen auf *-bert* zu tun. Tatsächlich ist dies vielleicht die häufigste Endung der altfranzösischen Namen (Aubert, Dagobert, Engelbert . . .)" and he cites a dozen of other similar names, forgetting that Bohemond's father was Robert (Guiscard).

Antar's expedition as an ally of Byzantium is simply Alexios Comnenos' and Palæologos' war against Robert and Bohemond: and this at once clears up the name of the King of Rome, or of the Romans, Balkâm, who is Palæologos himself, but under the French form of Baligan.

The Antar Romance thus affords us an unexpected confirmation of our identification of Paleologos with Baligan in the *Chanson de Roland*. In the Syria of the Crusaders, evidently, the famous war of 1081–1085, celebrated by the French trouvères, inspired the Arab novelist, and we may conclude that the Antar Romance was completed exactly at the same period as the other epics aforementioned.

We shall now return to the *Chanson de Roland* itself and try to use the conclusions reached by us to solve some of the problems of the French Iliad.

I repeat that the use of the comparative method seems a priori justified because of the strikingly similar conditions in which that epic arose and grew. Digenis, the historical Digenis, fell in a fight against the Arabs of Asia Minor in the year 788; Roland, in 778. We may add that Sayyid-Battal's death is only 40 years older.

Both the Byzantine and Moslem gestes, but especially the Moslem, were revived in Seldjouk times and came to an end after the serious set-back inflicted upon the Seldjouks by the Crusaders. They were not revived, however, by the glorious age of Saladin, nor by the rise of the Ottomans. In other words, the Moslem epic was fixed some time after 1100.

If this be so, and we have proved that it cannot be gainsaid,

we shall be struck by the similarity in the development of the French geste. So far as the *Chanson de Roland* is concerned, the two schools which advocate either a date before 1100 or a date after 1100 agree fundamentally about the chronological question. Nobody has ever thought of dating the present chanson much later than 1100, or much earlier than 1085. Roughly speaking, we may and must state that operating in two widely separated fields and using altogether different methods, two groups of scholars have been led, or rather compelled to ascribe almost the same chronological starting point and almost the same terminus to their particular *matière epique*.

Now, while we know all about the successive forms, editions, *remaniements* of the Greek poem of Digenis, and as we clearly see how the last edition of the Moslem Romance came about (the main difference between both is that the Greek epic was certainly crystallized about the year 1000, while the Moslem Romance, mainly composed of seventh, eighth, ninth century stuff, was remodeled under the influence of events of the late XIth), there are many conflicting theories about the making of the *Chanson de Roland*; and perhaps the experience or skill gained through our study of the oriental epics will enable us to choose between those conflicting doctrines and systems and provide us with some clues hitherto unknown to our learned colleagues the Romanists.

One thinks perhaps of the question of the *Cantilènes*. But I shall not now enter into that question, although I believe that it is very simple, and that we cannot account for the rise of any epic without assuming that primitive form of *Chansons de Geste*, so well borne out in the Byzantine field.

I shall limit myself to another problem; our *Chanson de Roland*, according to Bédier, is "un poème d'un seul jet," written for the first time and created almost "ex nihilo" by a French poet, shortly after 1100, under the fresh and powerful influence of the crusading spirit. Bédier denies that there was ever any other *Chanson de Roland* in existence before that date. He particularly hates, ridicules and rejects the very conception of a *Chanson* of, let us say, about 1010 or so. He rejects as legendary the clear-cut statement according to which the *Chanson* was sung at Hastings in 1066 by Tailfer.[4]

[4] The testimony of Wace, writing about 1160 in his *Geste des Normands* is borne

Almost all those who, in recent years, have approached the problem from the historical side, and above all Ferdinand Lot and Fawtier, came to the conclusion that Bédier was entirely wrong, and that there are many particulars in the *Chanson* which point to historical facts and surroundings of the end of the Xth and the beginning of the XIth century: for instance, the mention of *Laon.* Laon was the capital of the Carolingians in the Xth century, from the reign of Charles the Simple on. See laisse 207, which begins

> Amis Rolanz, jo m'en irai en France:
> Com jo sorai a Loon en ma chambre. . . .

According to Fawtier and Lot, this is redolent of the first quarter of the XIth century, whereas the following laisse, which mentions *Aix*, seems to revert to the historical truth, and, moreover, by its curious enumeration of the conquests of Robert Guiscard,

> Romain, Poillain, e tuit cil de Palerne,
> E cil d'Afrique e cil de Califerne,

proves that it was written at the end of the XIth century.

Of course we know the too easy rejoinder of stubborn unitarians (in the philological sense of the word), who would make us believe that the laisses similaires are "un procédé littéraire et rien de plus." But everything has been said "pro and contra" on that subject. My aim and my duty are only to lay before you new and, I hope, conclusive and decisive evidence proving that our French *Chanson* in its final form cannot even be conceived unless one bears in mind historical events of the sixties, seventies, and

---

out by or goes back to William of Malmesbury (1120–1127) who speaks of a "cantilena Rolandi" at Roncevaux (cf. Jenkins p. 43 and p. 9). Here is the text of William: "Tunc cantilena Rollandi inchoata ut Martium viri exemplum pugnaturos accenderet inclamatoque Dei auxilio proelium consertum." This testimony, which cannot really be disposed of in good faith, suffices to annihilate Bédier's theory or theories, for either "cantilena" refers to some earlier edition of our poem, as we believe, or else it designates some kind of ballad. Now both assumptions, and especially the latter, are "ein Greuel" to Bédier! Cf. my articles on the Chanson de Roland: "La Chanson de Roland et Byzance, ou de l'utilité du Grec pour les Romanistes," *Byzantion*, XIV (1939), 265–315. (With the collaboration of M. R. de Keyser); cf. *ibid.*, pp. 689–691; "La Chanson de l'an 1085 ou l'étymologie de Baligant et de Califerne," *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, XXV (1939), 211 ff.; "The actual date and the true historical background of the Chanson de Roland," *Belgium*, April 2, 1942, pp. 59–64, "Les dieux Cahu, Baraton, Tervagant etc.," *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* (1939–1944), p. 451 ff.

eighties of the eleventh century, and second, that this *Chanson* itself is a new edition of an older one, based on folk-songs or, at any rate, older stuff, but certainly later in its full conception than the year 1002 and prior to the battle of Hastings.

The first point, I think, is sufficiently demonstrated in my four publications on the *Chanson de Roland*, the first article in *Byzantion*, the lengthy Mémoire in the *Bulletin de l'Académie*, the short but, I hope, useful summary with some new texts and facts, which recently appeared in our periodical *Belgium* and the paper on Tervagant and other "Moslem Gods" which has lately appeared in our *Annuaire*.

My theory may be summarized in a few lines. The Baligan[5] episode is conspicuous for what the Germans would call a "Völkertafel," a catalogue of thirty pagan nations or places from which new Moslem enemies are supposed to come in order to rescue Marsile of Saragossa and to repulse Charlemagne after he had already avenged Roland, and cut the Arabs of Spain proper to pieces. This *Völkertafel* has never been properly studied and still less understood; everyone had failed to recognize that it was largely consistent, that it constituted a coherent whole, with no fanciful names at all. Never has the anti-historical bias of a Bédier shown itself so poor and so barren. Never has, on the contrary, the sound historical sense of a Gaston Paris appeared more justified and more prophetic. But both, and the whole crowd of international romanists, have always lacked the necessary knowledge of Eastern, or rather of Byzantine history, to solve a very simple problem. The host of Baligan is composed of thrice ten battalions or escheles and that which heads the first group is composed of "cels de Butentrot." The Butentrot problem and its discussion will remain as one of the disgraces upon Romance studies, and will prove forever that nothing can be achieved in the field of *Literaturgeschichte* without historical training.

The lamentable wavering between the two Butentrots, that of Epirus and that of Cilicia, to which American scholarship has contributed a great deal, was quite useless. If Butentrot dominates, as it does, a whole warlike episode, it must be because some great event took place there. The discovery of the battle of Butentrot, overlooked by all historians, although twenty lines of

[5] Or, *Baligant*.

the Latin epic of William of Apulia were dedicated to it, has shown that the name was not chosen at random by the trouvère. The battle of Butentrot, opposite Corfu, in 1081 was the first clash on the Greek mainland between a sea-borne invasion army coming from Italy and the defenders of the Greek soil. It was the first hostile conflict in the Balkan peninsula between West and East since very olden times, since the last days of the Roman Republic. And that momentous event was apt to strike the imagination of its contemporaries for many reasons; first, the ignorant and ambitious Normans of Robert Guiscard were under the impression that they were beginning the most daring and the most fruitful conquest, that of the older and richer part of the world, full of wealth, of luxury, of treasures, of marvels; second, they had been led to believe that their war was a holy war, the First Crusade. They were fighting under the standard of Saint Peter against a mixed army composed of almost countless national elements, most of them barbarous and pagan, which circumstances lent color to the pretense of Robert that he was a Crusader. The vanguard of the Byzantine army, which was repulsed near Butentrot, was composed of 2000 Turks!

Of course, for the past 10 or 15 years Norman chieftains and Norman rank-and-file had been fighting the Turks or with the Turks in Asia Minor, with the Byzantine armies or as rebellious units against them; it will suffice to name the names of Robert Crispin and of Roussel or Oursel de Bailleul and to recall the ephemeral States founded by them in Cappadocia and Pontus.

But it was the first time that the big Italo-Norman army came in touch with those dreaded fighters, and it must be acknowledged that their use, as well as that of the savage Patzinaks as auxiliary troops by the Byzantines, seemed to justify Western prejudice against that so-called Roman Empire of the East, which was notoriously schismatic since the fatal year 1054, and which did not refrain from seeking the support of the worst enemies of our faith.

The very name of Butentrot thus evoked the warlike opening of a great historical drama, that of the Crusades. But, viewed from the Norman side, with Norman bias, it appeared as a contest for the conquest of the Byzantine Empire, a program which materialized in 1203, after four Norman attempts, by Guiscard in 1081–1085, by Bohemond in 1106, that by Roger II in 1147, that of William II in 1185.

Butentrot is a poetical prelude to three or four great wars. That name, as we say in French, "est tout un programme" and its significance is made unmistakable by the overwhelming majority of the 29 other names, some of which, like Jericho, Canineis, Glos (Glossa), Bali, are in Epirus, or are Epirus itself (terre de Bire). And the rest are the Greek or foreign regiments of any Byzantine army of the end of the XIth century, named in every Charter or Chrysobull of those times and in many passages of the historians.

From the Patzinaks to the Serbs, from the Turks to the Persians, from the Armenians to the Valachians, or Bulgarians (the people of Samuel), not to speak of the old native regiment of the Opsicians (Occian) or of the curious Argoiles (Argolici).

Most of those names had been recognized and identified at least by somebody. Many people had rightly guessed what Butentrot was. Tavernier had understood "terre de Bire." Even in the notes of Jenkins, you will find somewhere, half hidden and naturally rejected with contempt, the idea that Jericho was in Epirus too. Even the most difficult names had been deciphered, including Occian, Opsicianus (Jenkins, p. 225), including Argoilles, for Jenkins says, p. 229: "Argoilles: Not identified. The occurrence of the name at v. 3474 in company with *Occiant* (see v. 3246) and *Bascle* (see v. 3474) may indicate that Argoille is at no great distance from these. The word seems to represent *Argolica*." But here, naturally, Jenkins loses the track: "besides Argolis in Greece, there were cities of Argos in Asia Minor, in Cilicia Minor and in Lycaonia. . . ." The explanation is quite different. If the Baligant episode lists a troop of Argoilles, it is because, after all, there were some . . . Greeks in the Greek army and the Greeks are called Argolici by William of Apulia.[6]

William of Apulia's poem, written about 1099, ends with the death of Robert Guiscard and was extant at le Bec and Mont

[6] Argoilles are mentioned three times in the *Chanson*, always in the Baligant episode: 3259, 3474, 3527. This is decisive, because it once more stresses the close connection between our *Chanson* with the Baligant episode and the *Gesta Roberti* written by William of Apulia at the end of the eleventh century. The unique manuscript of this Latin epic is to be found at Avranches and comes from the Abbaye of Mont Saint Michel, while another manuscript, now lost, belonged to the Abbaye of Le Bec. This will strike all students of Roland: the names of Saint Michel and Le Bec are constantly quoted in books dealing with the *Chanson*, the origin of which is so clearly Norman. An *Argolicus exercitus* is mentioned by Liudprand of Cremana, *Scriptores rerum germ. in usum Schol.*, ed. Becker (1915), p. 191.

Saint Michel. Now we know that *Turoldus*, last redactor of the Roland (see v. 4002) was either Turoldus de Burgo, son or nephew of Bishop Odon of Bayeux, half-brother of the conqueror, and later Abbot of Peterborough (dead 1098), or Turoldus of Envermeu, who became Bishop of Bayeux after Odo (who died at Palermo in 1097) and afterwards a monk in the Monastery of Le Bec (1093–1124).

The exact date of his death is unknown. We shall not today try to liquidate the Turoldus question. But it is sufficiently clear that the author of the Baligant-Roland was a Norman, chiefly interested in the Balkan wars of Robert and Bohemond, and it is equally evident that he could not have been so completely absorbed by this Greek incident, if he had written after the first Crusade proper. The use by him of a learned source like William's poem is decisively proved by the word Argoilles. Only a learned poet could use such an artificial expression.[7]

Our thesis, I think, will be generally accepted: Roland, with Baligant, belongs to the end of the XIth century. But we must prove our second thesis, which is that of Fawtier and Lot: the author of the Roland-Baligant added the Balkanic episode to an older poem, shorter, the conclusion of which was the defeat of Marsile and Ganelon's punishment, coming immediately after the victory recounted in laisse 179.

This thesis is almost self-evident. If one accepts both my date for our Chanson and the fact that it was sung at Hastings, it is clear that Baligant is a late embellishment; and I need not recall that this appears evident, too, for a great many philological reasons. But it is proved or confirmed in the most impressive way by the existence of that Latin poem, the *Carmen de Proditione Guenonis*, which is obviously a latinization (quite similar to the *Waltharius*) of the older Chanson.

Now, in the *Carmen* there is no Baligan-episode at all. We may safely revert to the commonsense-solution of the problem, which is really not a problem: we are happy enough to possess in the *Carmen* at least a résumé of the Roland which we have postulated

[7] It is true that William's poem seems to know the capture of Jerusalem. But this is a quite isolated mention, probably interpolated. The poem, like the *Chanson*, is uninfluenced by the great events which, naturally, no comparison being possible between the capture of Jericho in Epirus and the siege of Jerusalem, plunged the former story into oblivion.

and which everything compels us to assume: a Roland prior to Hastings and which we may date from 1025 to 1040.

An even more important date now requires determination: the *terminus post quem* the older Roland himself must have been written.

It is clear that the older poem was already characterized by the name of Marsile given to the adversary of Charlemagne, to the Moslem Charlemagne. Of course, Marsile is not a relic of the oldest period of the epic: there is no Marsile in the history of Moslem Spain, in the 8th or 9th century.

Other *Chansons de Geste*, like those of the Guillaume d'Orange cycle, more faithful to history, speak of Deramé, which is naturally Abd-er-Rahman. Why then Marsile? It must point to a more recent period of strife between Islam and Christendom. It is the familiar anachronism, by which, from time to time the epic is rejuvenated.[8]

Let us recall the constant appearance of later heroes in the Byzantine and Moslem epics; like Laon, it may point to the history of the Xth century, and once we accept that possibility, the riddle is solved, for there is only one really famous, universally known name of a Moslem ruler of Spain, after Abd-er-Rahman. It is Al-Mansour, who, one must not forget it, wrested Catalonia from the Franks. Al-Mansour, which means "the victorious," was not of royal origin. His real name was Ibn Abi Amir.

In spite of his heroic achievements, in spite of the fact that he had reconquered a large part of Christian Spain and seemed about to liquidate the last independent States in the Peninsula, it was morally impossible for him to become a calif. Of course, he never ceased to aim at that supreme consecration of his merits and fame and, in February or March 997, it looked as though he had attained his goal, for the calif Hisham II resigned. But his resignation could not be accepted and Al-Mansour was soon compelled to

[8] Another name for a Moslem chieftain is the famous Thibaud, the adversary of Guillaume d'Orange. We shall prove that this name did not deserve to be ridiculed by Bédier. For Tedbalt l'Esturman = Thibaut d'Arabie, or l'Escler, or l'Esclavon (see *La Chançun de Willame*, ed. E. S. Tyler, New York; Oxford University Press, 1919, p. 172) is really the king of the Teutons, Teutobodus, *alias* Teutobochus, who was supposed to have been vanquished and slain at Orange. Guillaume de Toulouse became Guillaume d'Orange because he was credited with Marius' victories. This is a beautiful example of the role played by Roman monuments, connected with classical and local traditions, in the rise of mediaeval epics.

allow Hisham to appear in public "coiffé du haut bonnet que les califes seuls avaient le droit de porter." [9]

Marsile is the very name of Mansour, scarcely altered.

It is well known that *r* and *l*, especially as pronounced in Arabic, are often confused in the Western languages and the same remark applies to *i* and *u*. To limit ourselves to the Chanson de Roland, we shall quote only a very characteristic parallel. In verse 3131 and again 3191, we find a Syrian messenger called both times "uns Sulians" (viz: Syrianus). Here too, we have the equation u = i in an Oriental name.

But the best proof perhaps that Marsile is Mansour, the most dreaded enemy of the Christians who ever ruled in Spain, is afforded by the curious passages of the epic where he appears along with another character called Al-Galife, the Calif.

These passages have always been so many puzzles to all commentators, because "Al-Galife" is nowhere properly introduced, but taken for granted, so to speak, and considered to be a kind of President of Marsile's counsel. His first speech is rather contemptuous for Marsile (laisse 35). After a warrantable fit of anger, furious at a defiant speech of Ganelon "the best of the Sarrasins prevailed upon Marsile to sit down again on his throne."

Dist l'algalifes: "Mal nos avez baillit
Que lo Franceis asmastes a ferir:
Lui doüssiez escolter ed odir."

"You did us a bad turn in making to strike the Frenchman. You should have listened to him, attended to his words." [10]

And it is to the Calif, who acts as a kind of wise umpire, desirous of mending Ganelon's "gaffes," that the Frenchman replies, not to Marsile. There are still six passages where we find Algalife. Verse 505 in Marsile's Council held in that famous orchard, we find:

Ses meillors homes meinet ensemble od sei,
E Blancandrins i vint a l chanut peil,
E Jurfalés ki est sis filz ed heirs,
E l'algalifes, sis oncles e fedeilz.

[9] About Al-Mansour, see naturally R. Dozy, *Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne*, new edition by Levy-Provençal, II (1932), 200 ff. Page 222, Ibn Abi Amir becomes Hadjib or chamberlain. Page 251, "il était donc Roi et n'était pas encore Calife." Page 255, resignation of the Calif. Page 256, the Calif is made to appear in public. Page 263, death of Al-Mansour and Christian legend about it. His end, according to that legend (he is defeated by the Christians and goes to hell), closely resembles Marsile's end in the *Chanson*. [10] Mrs. Sherwood's translation.

Shortly before, v. 493, Marsile declares that Charlemagne wants to receive his uncle the Algalife as a hostage (which does not seem to be Charlemagne's genuine claim, at least it had never been mentioned before by any Moslem or Christian character of the Chanson). — But, v. 681, Ganelon, in his false report to Charlemagne, seems to assume that the claim had been made and accepted, for he invents an excuse for the fact that he does not bring the Algalife among the hostages. He reports that he was drowned before his eyes in a tempest which caused his ship to be sunk.

Algalife reappears, v. 1914, where he remains to confront the French at Roncevaux after Marsile's flight [11] and the same Algalife, vers 1943, mortally wounds Oliver in the back, to be slain by Oliver shortly before the latter's death.

The role of the Calif has prompted many doubts and his relationship to Marsile has been spoken of as puzzling and obscure. But, if we accept that Marsile is Al-Mansour, then everything becomes clear; it was a touch of local color, for a poet acquainted with Spanish Moslem affairs at the beginning of the XIth century, to assume the coexistence and, as it were, the joint rule of two sovereigns, the King and the Calif.

Of course, this was not, or no longer understood at the end of the eleventh century and from that time evidently dates a passage like 1913 ff., where the Calif is represented as a foreign ruler. (In Spain the title was discontinued after 1060):

> Remés i est sis oncles l'algalifes,
> Ki tint Kartágene, Alferne e Garmalie,
> Ed Ethiope une tere maldite:
> La neire gent en at en sa baillie.

For many reasons, these verses are to be connected with the counter-offensive of the African Moslems under Yusuf in the eighties of the XIth century.

But Algalife, certainly, belongs, along with Marsile, to the older Chanson.

I shall not enlarge in this paper upon many details which bear out our thesis. Let me say only that an important episode which, like that of Baligant, is absent from the *Carmen de Proditione Guenonis*, appears to be like it an interpolation of the end of the XIth century. It is the *Blancandrin* episode. Blancandrin de

[11] From now on, the Oxford manuscript, probably thinking that Algalife is drowned, speaks of Marganice.

Valfunde is the wisest adviser of the Moslem King. He proposes to send an Embassy to Charlemagne to appease him and to promise on behalf of King Marsile to turn Christian.

He himself heads the delegation, addresses Charlemagne, promising hostages and everything. One knows that that embassy seems to constitute a "double emploi" with Charlemagne's own embassy, headed by Ganelon, which is essential to the story. Blancandrin's role has always seemed suspicious. It must have been added at a late period for some peculiar reason. It is curious that he is utterly forgotten in the different battles and never again mentioned. For that reason, we are convinced, like Fawtier, that here is again a name famous about 1080–1085, which crept in into the *Chanson.* Now, from 1075 to 1092, the most famous character of Moslem Spain was certainly Ben Yahya-Alkadir, first King of Toledo from 1075 to 1085, and after that date, by the favor of Alfonso the VIth to whom he had bowed (just as Blancandrin proposes to bow to Charles), King of Valencia. It is striking that Blancandrin (Ben-Alkadir), is said to be of Valfunde (it is well known that many historical names are fancifully altered in their final part to fit the assonance, and it even happens that, because of different assonances, they appear in 2 laisses in 2 different forms). The Alkadir of history was a very influential but also unreliable figure, oscillating between Christians and Moslems with great skill and, probably with full right, suspect to both camps.

But he seems to have been extremely dignified, "wise," that is to say, smart, learned and scholarly. The author of what we may call the Blancandrin episode, while he presents him as a wily and treacherous envoy and uses him to seduce Ganelon, seems to admire his wisdom after all in the service of his own cause, and the whole character is drawn according to this sketch at the beginning of laisse 3:

> Blancandrins fut des plus sávies paiens,
> De vasselage fut asez chevaliers:
> Prodome i out por son seignor aidier. . . .[12]

We may add another Moslem name: Jurfaleu or Jurfalé or Jurfaré (again the alternation L,R). Verse 504, Jurfalé is men-

[12] About the career of Alkadir-Blancandrin, consult Dozy, edition Levy Provençal, III, 118, 120–122, 132, 227–228, 239 and 240.

tioned as the son and heir of Marsile, and it is remarkable that one of the last Moslem kings of Valencia, before the conquest of that town by the Cid was King Jafar, 1092–1095.

I also find in Menendez's book, p. 307, the Palace of Aljaferia in Saragossa, from Abu-Djafar, end of the XIth century.[13]

These examples will suffice. Those who maintain that there is no history at all in medieval epics, that the names of the principal characters are either fanciful or, if historic, prove nothing, should acknowledge that he who does not find anything historical in the *Chanson de Geste* is generally a pure philologist who knows history only from current text books. Menéndez Pidal has shown that the closer study of history is always, not likely, but sure to clear up more puzzles in the medieval poems. Of course, Al-Mansour has almost nothing in common with the traditional adversary of Charlemagne, but a poem where that adversary is called after Al-Mansour, who died in the year 1002, and who was immediately represented by Christian epic legend as having been slain in a disastrous battle must belong to the first half of the eleventh century, while the Balkanic and Guiscardian background of the Baligant episode, and many a trait of Spanish history, like Balaguer besieged about 1080,[14] or the role of Blancandrin-Alkadir, point to those years of epic struggles in Catalonia and in Epirus, when the crusading spirit which led to the true Crusades stimulated the trouveres and jongleurs and invited them to rejuvenate the old and familiar songs by fresh memories and timely names of strange places and strange men.

To wind up, may I praise once more the insight of Gaston Paris, who said, speaking of the names in the *Chanson de Roland*, so unjustly belittled by Joseph Bédier: "je crois que ces noms se rattachent tous à quelque souvenir et à quelque tradition." But perhaps I should praise not only Gaston Paris, but also the creative genius of those fighting and singing Normans to whom we owe two French epopees:

"Celle qu'ils ont jadis écrite avec le glaive"

[13] See also Menéndez Pidal, *La España del Cid*, English translation by Harold Sunderland, London 1934, p. 178, about the palace in Saragossa called *al Jaferia*: It was he (a local ruler), 1046–1081, who gave his first name of *Abu Jafar* to the handsome *al Jaferia* palace on the outskirts of the city.

[14] Balaguet, Balasguet, vers 63, 200, 894; "Balaguer en Catalogne sur la Sègre,

and that which Tailfer and Turoldus "allaient chantant" . . . Nobody will be astonished to find in the *Chanson* pêle-mêle, as we say, in a kind of geographical and historical topsy-turvy, echoes of Catalonian, south-Italian, Albanian, and even Asiatic battlefields: Balaguer and Berbegal (Brigal) near Barbastro, Palermo and Butentrot, Cappadoce and Lycanor.

Let us remember that the same men very often had fought in Spain, in Southern Italy, in Sicily, in Albania, and had finally tried to found a principality before the Crusade proper in Cappadocia, Lycaonia, or Pontus, like Robert Crispin and Oursel de Bailleul.[15] It is in the wake of splendid adventurers like these that we must look either for the trouvère himself, or rather for those whose vivid tales inspired the new laisse of the final *Chanson de Roland*, the édition définitive of that masterpiece, so precisely dated and so important for history.

---

aujourd'hui encore prononcé Balaguet." As Bédier says, III, 371, and Jenkins repeats, p. 31, its fame in France dates from the 5 years' siege it underwent during the French expedition of 1085.

[15] On the Normans in Asia Minor, see G. Schlumberger, "Deux chefs normands des armées byzantines au XIe siècle," *Revue Historique*, VI (1881), 289–303.

BOOK REVIEWS

G. OSTROGORSKY, *Geschichte des Byzantinischen Staates* (Munich: Beck, 1940). Cloth. Pp. xix, 448. Huit cartes, dont deux dans le texte.

A cette heure où l'importance géographique et historique de Byzance-Constantinople-Istanbul se révèle une fois de plus décisive, et où la question des détroits domine le conflit européen et mondial, à cette heure où les domaines, jadis byzantins, ceux d'Europe comme ceux d'Asie, sont de nouveau l'axe du monde civilisé, il n'est plus besoin sans doute de chercher des excuses à nos études, de plaider pour l'histoire byzantine. Celle-ci est décidément réintroduite par la force même de l'actualité dans la culture générale, même en Amérique. Ce n'est pas un paradoxe de dire que les Etats-Unis n'accueilleraient pas avec une stupeur inerte la prise de Constantinople comme ce fut le cas pour l'Europe Occidentale de 1453.

Quoiqu'il en soit, en plusieurs langues et dans plusieurs pays, des Histoires Byzantines complètes, synthétiques et détaillées, ont paru coup sur coup, depuis quelques mois. Nous avons rendu compte ici même du nouveau *Vasiliev*, de la dernière histoire byzantine de *Charles Diehl*; dans le fascicule précédent de *Byzantion*, M. P. Charanis a analysé l'excellent ouvrage en grec moderne de M. Constantin Amandos, et M. Vasiliev lui-même, le louable essai de l'Ukrainien soviétique *Levčenko*, premier balbutiement de la Byzantinologie russe, autrefois si florissante, après 25 années de mortel silence. Enfin, par une coïncidence tragique, et dont le sympathique auteur est bien innocent, nous venons de recevoir en Amérique la synthèse longtemps attendue, avec une impatiente confiance si l'on peut dire, de *Georges Ostrogorsky*, rédigée en allemand, imprimée en Allemagne, comme erster Teil, zweiter Band, d'un *Byzantinisches Handbuch*.[1]

M. Georges Ostrogorsky est bien connu de nos lecteurs. Tout le monde sait que depuis 1933 il est professeur d'Histoire Byzantine à l'Université de Belgrade, et qu'il est né en Russie. Le fait qu'il ait été chargé depuis longtemps de renouveler ou plutôt de remplacer l'*Abriss der Byzantinische Kaisergeschichte* qui termine la seconde édition (1897) de la *Byzantinische Literaturgeschichte* de Karl Krumbacher, prouve à la fois

[1] Im Rahmen des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft, begründet von Iwan von Müller, herausgegeben von Walter Otto, zwölfte Abteilung, erster Teil, zweiter Band; Beck. München 1940. Mit 8 Karten, davon 2 im Text. Ce compte-rendu a été écrit au printemps de 1941.

combien sa compétence était reconnue jusque dans le centre allemand des études byzantines, et (je veux, même et surtout dans ce moment plus que tragique, rendre hommage à la vérité) comment certains universitaires allemands, chargés de la publication de ce *Handbuch*, réussirent à éluder, en faveur d'Ostrogorsky, certains paragraphes odieux. On me comprendra à demi-mot. Ajoutons que le livre était imprimé entièrement au moment où la nouvelle guerre mondiale éclata. Je puis l'attester, en ayant vu les épreuves à Belgrade, chez l'auteur, en juillet 1939. Le manuscrit lui-même était prêt depuis la fin de l'année 1937.

Au verso de la page XIX, on trouvera des "Nachträge" où sont cités quelques travaux très récents, dont notre dernier "Mémoire sur la Chanson de Roland," *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, XXV (1939), paru en janvier 1940, et deux articles qui portent la date de 1940, mais que l'auteur avait pu lire sur épreuves à la fin de 1939 déjà. Ce sont ceux de: D. Anastasijević: "Carskij god v Vizantii," *Annales de l'Institut Kondakov*, XI (1940), et V. Corović, "Pitanje o hronologiji u delima Sv. Save," *Godišnjica* (1940).

On voit que, si son livre a vu le jour après le début de la catastrophe mondiale, et si la conscience professionnelle de l'auteur a pu y insérer à la dernière minute des références qui lui donnent le cachet de l'actualité scientifique, il s'agit d'une oeuvre mûrie longtemps avant les angoissantes préoccupations d'aujourd'hui, à une époque où, un an avant Munich, je précise, l'on pouvait croire en Allemagne et ailleurs (avec beaucoup d'optimisme, il est vrai) non seulement que la paix européenne ne serait pas troublée, mais encore que les outrances de certains régimes finiraient par s'atténuer.

Nous pouvons bien révéler qu'en ces temps d'illusion généreuse, la collaboration au *Handbuch* de Georges Ostrogorsky (professeur à Breslau jusqu'en 1933) était considérée comme un heureux présage.

Retenons ce présage en dépit de tout et félicitons-nous de posséder enfin un véritable manuel scientifique d'Histoire Byzantine, écrit par un homme qui possède toutes les qualités requises en l'occurrence, et notamment une souveraine clarté de pensée et d'expression, et, en dépit de l'originalité de ses conceptions, une objectivité aujourd'hui très rare.

Nous avons admiré particulièrement l'équité et l'urbanité avec quoi M. Ostrogorsky, en exposant les controverses auxquelles il a été mêlé personnellement, fait leur part aux théories de ses adversaires et même de contradicteurs acharnés et sans mesure. Ajoutons que dans une préface de quatre pages, l'éditeur du *Handbuch*, le professeur Walter Otto, fait l'histoire de cette entreprise scientifique. C'est le mérite de M. Otto d'avoir dépassé en quelque sorte le Krumbacher en substituant à son *Histoire de la Littérature Byzantine* un *Manuel Byzantin*: "qui

doit montrer aux investigateurs de l'Antiquité proprement dite (*Altertumsforscher*), comment tout ce qui a été créé par le génie grec, le génie romain, et le génie de l'antique Orient, survit dans l'Empire Byzantin," bien que l'Etat byzantin et sa culture ne doivent pas être considérés uniquement comme une suite du monde ancien, mais comme une unité culturelle neuve et indépendante. En conséquence, "à côté de la littérature, le milieu géographique, le peuple, la langue, l'Etat, son développement, sa constitution, son administration, son économie, l'Eglise et l'Art, devaient être envisagés, décrits, étudiés." Karl Krumbacher avait fait commencer son histoire littéraire avec le VIème siècle, le siècle de Justinien; c'était là une grave erreur qui sera réparée dans le nouveau *Handbuch*, où le IVe et le Ve siècle après J.-C. seront traités avec plus ou moins de développement, comme constituant, au moins pour Byzance, la période des origines.

La plupart des collaborateurs désignés pour le *Handbuch* sont morts avant d'avoir terminé ou même entrepris leur tâche. Finalement trois hommes furent chargés de rédiger l'histoire de Byzance: MM. Fels et Dölger acceptèrent d'écrire les chapitres intitulés: "Land, Volk und Sprache." Ces chapitres devaient figurer en tête de l'ouvrage qui nous est présenté aujourd'hui. Mais ces deux auteurs n'ayant pu être prêts à temps, M. Otto s'est décidé à faire paraître d'abord la partie rédigée par M. Ostrogorsky seul, sous le titre de *Geschichte des Byzantinischen Staates*, et il écrit, à la page VIII de son Introduction "Cette partie est donc publiée comme second volume de la Ière section, bien que le premier volume (dont nous espérons qu'il suivra beintôt) soit indispensable à l'intelligence de l'histoire de l'Empire Byzantin proprement dite. Ensuite viendra la seconde section (dont les auteurs ne sont pas nommés) et qui nous parlera entre autres de l'Eglise, de la Théologie, de l'Art."

Il serait prématuré de discuter ce plan qui peut-être subira encore des modifications, et il serait vain d'exprimer aucun regret au sujet des vicissitudes de la publication ou des tribulations des auteurs. C'est le cas de dire avec les Anciens: "*στέργε τὰ παρόντα. . . .*"

Le livre de M. Ostrogorsky, pour commencer par la fin, se distingue avantageusement de ses prédécesseurs et de ses rivaux par 8 cartes dont 2 dans le texte.

Ce sont: (1) l'Empire de Justinien vers 565 (d'après *Uspenski*)
(2) l'organisation des thèmes d'Asie Mineure des VII^{e} au IX^{e} siècle (d'après *Gelzer* et *Ostrogorsky*).
(3) le premier royaume bulgare (d'après *Zlatarski*, *Runciman* et *Ostrogorsky*).
(4) le royaume de Basile II (d'après une esquisse d'*Ostrogorsky*).
(5) le royaume des Comnènes (d'après la *Cambridge Mediaeval History* et *Ostrogorsky*).

(6) l'époque de la domination latine à Constantinople (d'après une esquisse d'Ostrogorsky).
(7) le royaume serke des Nemanides (d'après *St. Stanojević*).
(8) la décadence de l'Empire Byzantin au XIV^{e} siècle (d'après une esquisse d'*Ostrogorsky*).

Toutes ces cartes valent par leur caractère schématique: ce sont des croquis, mais des croquis très éloquents, qui, grâce à un emploi judicieux et parlant de diverses couleurs, pointillés, liserés et hachures, font apparaître au premier coup d'oeil bien des traits que les spécialistes eux-mêmes de l'histoire byzantine ne réalisent pas toujours. Ainsi, dans la carte de l'Empire de Justinien, le tracé tout en ourlet côtier de l'Afrique reconquise, la figure de l'Espagne byzantine, Cordoue, Carthagène, Baléares et la frontière orientale de la Lazique à l'Euphrate. La carte des thèmes (jusqu'au IX^{e} siècle) montre bien l'histoire du morcellement de l'Opsikion, des Anatoliques et de l'Armeniakon. La carte du royaume bulgare, tout en noir, est un peu moins claire et moins directe; ici M. Ostrogorsky me permettra de lui rappeler une amicale controverse toute récente: le tracé méridional de la frontière de Symeon, si dangereusement proche des villes byzantines de Berrhoea, Thessalonique, Seres, Andrinople et Constantinople même, et dont nous savons qu'il était marqué par des bornes au nom d'un ΟΛΓΟΥ ΤΑΡΧΑΝΟΥ a tout de même dû contribuer (j'en reste persuadé), à créer la légende de l'expédition d'Oleg contre Constantinople.

La carte de l'Empire des Comnènes est bonne, bien qu'un carton eût été nécessaire, à notre avis, pour illustrer le grand "rétablissement" d'Alexis I, de 1081 à 1118.

On regrette aussi l'absence d'un ou deux croquis montrant les progrès de la conquête turque et les éphémères formations territoriales dans la période qui va de Mantzikert aux Croisades. En revanche, la carte illustrant les suites de la IV^{e} croisade, et qui est l'oeuvre personnelle de l'auteur, est parfaite. Elle fera comprendre aux plus profanes le rôle dévolu dans le rétablissement de l'Empire grec, aux deux pays de marche, aux terres d'Akrites, en apparence destinées à disparaître les premières, sous les coups des Latins, des Bulgares, des Serbes et des Turcs, et qui ont servi de point d'appui à la reconquête et à la restauration sous les Anges, sous les Lascarides, et sous les Paléologues, précisément, parce que depuis des siècles la population y avait été entraînée à la lutte directe contre les ennemis d'Orient et d'Occident, et sans cesse renforcés d'auxiliaires de toutes races.

Il reste cependant, même chez Ostrogorsky, un *desideratum* cartographique auquel, nous l'espérons, M. Honigmann donnera bientôt satisfaction. Il faudrait une dizaine de cartons pour rendre intelligible

l'histoire des campagnes, surtout celles de Justinien, d'Héraclius, des Amoriens et des Macédoniens, et notamment des guerres bulgares de Basile II demeurées si obscures jusqu'aujourd'hui.

Le plan de l'ouvrage comporte, outre une introduction bibliographique sur l'Historiographie Byzantine à l'époque moderne, une liste des empereurs, mais non des papes, ni des patriarches, ni des califes, ni des émirs arabes, ni des souverains seldjoucides, ni des rois de Perse, ni des princes russes, ni des khans bulgares, ni des souverains serbes et croates.[2]

Il est impossible, on le conçoit, dans un simple compte rendu d'analyser et encore plus de discuter un livre aussi dense. Commençons par dire qu'à beaucoup d'égards il complète, dépasse et peut-être même remplacera dans l'usage courant la plupart des manuels similaires. Un de ses grands avantages sur ses devanciers et sur ses émules est la bibliographie très à jour qu'on lit non pas seulement de loin en loin en tête des chapitres (c'est aux sources originales qu'est réservé le petit texte qui précède l'exposé de chaque période), mais surtout en tête de chaque subdivision et au bas des pages. Nous avons beaucoup admiré et tout le monde appréciera la manière précise et concise, et je le répète, honnête, dont toutes les questions controversées sont présentées dans ces notes du pied de la page. Dans aucun cas nous n'avons rencontré de bibliographie "fictive" ou de bibliographie pour l'oeil, c'est à dire de savantes références à des livres que l'auteur n'aurait pas consultés: un petit malheur qui arrive, on le sait, dans les meilleures familles érudites. *De mortuis nihil nisi bene*, surtout quand ces morts sont des martyrs comme Nicola Iorga, mais tout le monde sait que chez lui et notamment dans l'annotation si copieuse et si touffue de sa dernière histoire des Roumains on trouve par centaines des références bibliographiques

[2] Cette lacune est d'autant plus sérieuse que l'histoire parabyzantine est traitée d'une manière fort épisodique par M. Ostrogorsky, comme on peut s'en rendre compte en feuilletant son index. L'Orient musulman surtout est assez négligé; et c'est dommage, car plus d'un chapitre de l'histoire militaire et diplomatique de Byzance reste incompréhensible, si l'on ne commence par étudier, avec beaucoup de soin, l'état du monde arabe à la même époque. Je ne citerai qu'un exemple: le succès éclatant de la reconquête de Jean Kourkouas.

A ce propos, je lis, p. 194: "Anno 927–28. Le péril bulgare une fois écarté, l'offensive byzantine commença en Orient. Le premier grand succès fut la prise de Mélitène, etc. . . ." Pas un mot de l'affaiblissement du califat à cette date, dont la première cause est la révolte de ces hérétiques musulmans appelés les Carmates. Leur rôle, absolument décisif dans l'écroulement du prestige de l'Islam au début du Xème siècle, est caractérisé en une phrase par l'évêque Aréthas de Césarée qui, s'adressant aux Infidèles, leur dit: "Votre invincibilité, dans laquelle vous voyiez une preuve de la divinité de votre religion, n'existe plus depuis que les Carmates vous ont battus."

Gibbon, qui ignorait ce texte, avait aperçu ce grand fait avec son génie coutumier, et j'avais déjà reproché à M. Vasiliev d'être ici en retard sur Gibbon.

de cette espèce: ouvrage ou article cité par ouï dire, souvent à contresens.

Nous n'allons pas, cela va de soi, chicaner l'auteur sur ses périodes. Elles correspondent à celles qui sont désormais généralement adoptées, et qui sont fondées sur une réalité historique incontestable. Il y a longtemps qu'on a vu qu'avec Héraclius et les Arabes commence, pour l'empire d'Orient un moyen-âge très différent, certes, du moyen âge occidental, mais très différent aussi du bas Empire romain de Constantin et de Justinien. La période iconoclaste, la troisième, se détache d'elle-même avec ses contrastes d'ombre et de lumière, son dynamisme souvent brutal, sa force et sa gloire incontestées. Je suis heureux de voir acceptée ma théorie d'après laquelle l'époque du dernier Amorien appartient à la période épique et brillante nommée à tort d'après les seuls "Macédoniens": [3] Car après tout un seul Macédonien fut vraiment grand, Basile II. Michel III était d'Amorium, Romain Lakapène et Jean Tzimiskes étaient Arméniens, Nicéphore Phokas Cappadocien. Il n'y a rien à dire des périodes VII et VIII qui sont, en effet, celles de la domination latine et de la restauration (1204, 1282) et du *Verfall und Untergang des byzantinischen Reiches* (1282–1453). Les périodes V et VI sont intitulées "*Die Herrschaft des hauptstädtischen Beamtenadels* (1025–1081)" et "*Die Herrschaft des Militäradels* (1081–1204)"; et ce sont les dénominations les plus originales peut-être — bien que depuis le livre classique de C. Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches vor den Kreuzzuegen*, écrit il y a 50 ans bientôt, en 1894, nous connaissions les mérites et les méfaits des fonctionnaires et des intellectuels dont la fine "culture," l'immoralité politique, la corruption distinguée et profonde annoncent la catastrophe du grand empire restauré de Basile II, et bien que l'époque des Comnènes, l'une des mieux connues de toute l'histoire byzantine, nous frappe en effet par son caractère éminemment militaire. Pour en finir avec cette description un peu extérieure, sinon superficielle du livre, je dirai que c'est surtout son articulation en sous-chapitres (en moyenne de 4 à 6 par période) qui le rend lisible, vivant, utile. Donnons quelques exemples de ces sous-titres bien choisis et qui prouvent que l'auteur ne néglige rien, ni l'histoire du droit, ni l'évolution économique dans la mesure où elle influe véritablement sur la marche des événements, ni l'histoire religieuse. Dans la première période le second *Abschnitt* s'intitule "Das Zeitalter der Völkerwanderung . . . und der christologischen Streitigkeiten." Le 6e paragraphe du chapitre 3 s'appelle "Die Staatsreformen Nikephoros' I

[3] Je n'oublie pas que ces Macédoniens provenaient en somme d'Arménie, mais je rappelle que la famille de Basile Ier malgré le loyalisme que suscita cette dynastie, n'a pas fourni à l'Empire les plus grandes figures du XI[e] siècle.

und die aussenpolitischen Gefahren . . . Byzanz und Krum." Dans IV, l'apogée de Byzance (843–1025), détachons: "Erstarkung des byzantinischen Reiches. Der Kampf der Zentralgewalt gegen die Feudalmächte und die kulturelle Blüte am byzantinischen Kaiserhof . . . Romanos Lakapenos und Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos," suivi de 5.: "Die Epoche der Eroberungen: Nikephorus Phokas und Johannes Tzimiskes," puis de 6.: "Der Höhepunkt der byzantinischen Machtentfaltung: Basilios II."

Quelques remarques sur cette première partie.

La première période (324–610) est traitée d'une manière plus brève, je ne dirai pas plus sommaire, qu'il n'est d'usage et nous approuvons fort cette brièveté, puisque, pour le Bas Empire proprement dit, les grands travaux de synthèse comme les monographies ont toujours abondé.

Dans le détail j'aurais aimé qu'Ostrogorsky nous dît la raison profonde de cette réforme administrative et financière, fiscale et militaire, dite de Dioclétien et de Constantin qui est et demeure la base de la constitution byzantine. Peut-être y a-t-il intérêt à se souvenir, à l'époque actuelle, du caractère d'*emergency* de beaucoup de mesures dictées par une nécessité menaçante, et qui ont duré à travers les siècles comme si souvent dure le provisoire. Des recherches récentes et techniques sur l'inflation, notamment celles de Segrè, d'après les papyrus ont l'air d'infirmer l'éloge excessif fait, page 23, du *solidus* constantinien. On eût désiré un traitement un peu plus développé de la querelle arienne — expédiée en une page! — parce qu'elle accentue cette séparation de l'Orient et de l'Occident dont tout le développement historique marquera de siècle en siècle la désaffection mutuelle. Nous avons ici un prologue au drame politico-religieux qui aura malheureusement tant de "reprises." Mais M. Ostrogorsky a été terriblement concis sur Justinien (pp. 42 à 48), comme si tout avait été dit sur ce grand règne par les Diehl, les Bury, les Kulakovski. Et pourtant il est bien difficile de souscrire sans réserve à des jugements comme "nicht zu halten waren die jüngst eroberten Gebiete im Westen, und die Geschwindigkeit, mit der sie dem Reich entschwanden, zeigt, auf welch schwachen Füssen das Werk Justinians stand." Je crois vraiment qu'il s'agit ici d'un jugement traditionnel que M. Ostrogorsky, pressé d'aborder les périodes suivantes, a transcrit sans y beaucoup réfléchir. Et pourtant il sait mieux que personne que Taormina (sans parler de Ravenne!) est restée byzantine jusqu'en 902, que Bari l'était encore un demi-millénaire après la mort de Justinien, que Manuel Comnène, en plein XII^{e} siècle, a trouvé le moyen d'y reparaître assez glorieusement sinon en personne, grâce à des troupes, de l'argent et surtout de chaleureuses sympathies, et qu'enfin la principale des reconquêtes de Justinien, l'Afrique, d'où la position

méditerranénne de Byzance pouvait toujours être regagnée, n'a été perdue pour l'Empire que par le cataclysme mondial et imprévisible de l'invasion arabe. Dans les chapitres suivants, de plus en plus neufs, et de mieux en mieux étudiés, on relèvera surtout les parties où la préparation spéciale de l'auteur lui donnait un avantage certain: celles qui touchent aux Slaves d'une part et d'autre part aux questions de droit public. On appréciera surtout l'érudition clairement condensée dans les notes comme celle de la page 64, sur le titre de *Basileus* ou encore celle de la page 63, sur la question de l'occupation croate et serbe;[4] ou encore la note 3 de la page 85 sur l'établissement des Slaves en Asie mineure. Je signale aussi les excellentes pages 88 et suivantes, avec leurs notes sur le νόμος γεωργικός. Les réformes de Nicéphore Ier (pages 129 à 139) et la question de l'usurpation de Charlemagne reçoivent un traitement développé et particulièrement instructif. De même, les recherches et publications des dernières années ont permis à l'auteur de marquer très fortement, sous la rubrique significative, "Anbruch des neuen Zeitalters" l'effort remarquable de consolidation et de renouvellement de Byzance au 9e siècle, en contraste marqué avec la décadence des Carolingiens et la crise de la papauté. L'époque de Michel III, qui est celle de Photius et de la grande mission slave de Cyrille et de Méthode, comme la grande réforme administrative et la codification, de Basile Ier et de Léon VI font, pour la première fois peut-être dans une histoire générale de Byzance, l'objet d'une présentation vraiment systématique de tous les faits. Ici, Ostrogorsky dépasse nettement Diehl et même Vasiliev. De même, le chapitre consacré à l'apogée de l'Empire sous Basile II est parfait.

Nous arrivons au problème des problèmes, à une question qui à l'heure actuelle apparaît vraiment la question centrale de toute l'histoire de Byzance. Pourquoi la décadence et la catastrophe d'Asie Mineure, l'année de Mantzikert (1071) qui est aussi celle de la prise de Bari et de la perte de l'Italie, viennent-elles si tôt après la splendeur de cette magnifique restauration, due au second Basile? C'est à ces pages que

[4] Toute la question est d'ailleurs à reprendre. Il ne suffit pas de dire que les informations du Porphyrogénète au sujet de la révolte des Croates contre les Avares sous Héraclius sont dignes de foi. Il faut les rapprocher de celles de Théophane, de Nicéphore le Patriarche, de Jean de Nikiou, des *Miracula Sancti Demetrii* et de la liste des rois bulgares. Il nous paraît certain que les Croates ont conservé le nom de ce chef Unogundur, Hun ou Bulgare, appelé Kubrat ou Kuvrat ou encore Kurt ou Kouver qui, effectivement, s'allia à l'Empire byzantin, se convertit à Constantinople, christianisa ce peuple et l'installa dans la Croatie actuelle. Je me propose de traiter ailleurs ce sujet. La vérité a été partiellement entrevue par quelques chercheurs. L'identité du chef bulgare et du chef croate avec le Kouver des Miracula est évidente, bien qu'elle ait été contestée par Zlatarski.

les contemporains de la moderne catastrophe européenne ouvriront et consulteront d'abord le livre, et je ne sais si les réponses données par Ostrogorsky au grand *Pourquoi* paraîtront ici suffisantes. Le fait qu'au moment des invasions seldjoucides et normandes Byzance n'avait plus à proprement parler d'armée nationale est établi, mais non encore suffisamment expliqué. Nous touchons ici à l'une des lacunes de l'investigation historique. Le livre, le grand livre sur l'armée byzantine et sa désintégration au XIe siècle reste encore à écrire malgré les matériaux excellents réunis, jadis, par Skabalanovič. Certes, on voit bien le fait essentiel: "Die Lockerung der Themenorganisation bedeutete nichts geringeres als die Auflösung der Staatsordnung, die Byzanz in den vorangehenden Jahrhunderten gross gemacht hat. Der dauernde Rückgang der einheimischen Streitkräfte liess wieder die Bedeutung des Söldnerheeres hervortreten." Mais pourquoi et comment les admirables institutions militaires des VIIIe et Xe siècles, la splendide armée fournie par les soldats-paysans des thèmes-frontières qui avaient eu raison de l'ennemi arabe, aboutissent-elles à cette carence lamentable si éloquemment décrite par les historiens à propos des recrutements de fortune de Romain Diogène au moment du péril seldjoucide? C'est ce que malgré tout, et en dépit de beaucoup d'explications partielles, nous ne voyons pas encore clairement. Il y a beaucoup de bonnes choses là-dessus aux pages 230–233. Mais la raison profonde n'est pas assez mise en lumière; elle est à chercher, probablement, dans le complexe de supériorité, dans le sentiment de sécurité excessive qui sont toujours la rançon des périodes dites d'apogée et de rétablissement. L'Empire byzantin comme l'Empire romain ne pouvaient se résigner à entretenir la coûteuse armée permanente qui seule pouvait assurer sa pérennité. Dès la fin du Xe siècle, le traité *De velitatione bellica* parle au passé des incursions arabes et des efficaces mesures militaires qui refoulaient si brillamment les envahisseurs au-delà des frontières. L'empire, visiblement, en était venu à considérer comme autrefois qu'il était moins coûteux pour l'Etat de prendre à sa solde des mercenaires barbares pour une campagne que de perpétuer le système des soldats-propriétaires ne payant que de leur personne. Je le répète, il nous faut une étude approfondie sur la désagrégation de la grande et bonne armée des Michel III, des Nicéphore Phokas et des Basile II. La question agraire, les lois contre la grande propriété et la féodalisation, l'immunité, la pronoia et le reste, ce ne sont que des épiphénomènes.

Nous savons que notre collègue, M. P. Charanis prépare le travail auquel nous pensons et dont le titre pourrait être, à cause de la date de 1071: Le Sedan byzantin et ses causes.

Que dire des derniers chapitres, sinon que nous avons admiré avec

quelle aisance, avec quelle sûreté de coup d'oeil et avec quelle grande netteté de ligne, l'auteur se ment dans un dédale des faits qui épouvantait un Gibbon? Pour les Croisades, citons comme un modèle de discussion objective la page 287 et la note si précise et si juste sur la composition ethnique du deuxième Empire bulgare et de l'origine des Asénides. Il était courageux, en un sens, pour un ami de la science bulgare, d'écrire contre P. Mutafčiev: "Andrerseits kann aber der Anteil der Walachen an den Anfängen dieses Reiches nicht geleugnet werden, zumal er nicht nur durch die berichtenden Quellen zur Genüge bezeugt wird, sondern auch durch den Umstand, dass im Briefwechsel zwischen Innozenz III und Kalojan die offizielle Titulatur der bulgarischen Herrscher meistens reges, bezw. imperatores Bulgarorum et Blacorum lautet." Il nous semble, quant à nous, qu'à cet égard le témoignage pro-Valaque, si j'ose ainsi dire, de Villehardouin et de Nicétas Choniate est absolument décisif. J'ai dit ailleurs combien je sympathise avec Ostrogorsky dans le problème, qui n'en est pas un, du "détournement de la Quatrième Croisade."

Peut-être M. Ostrogorsky aurait-il dû, dans le sous-chapitre: "Des Epiros Hochflug und Niedergang (309–317)," mettre mieux en relief encore l'un des plus beaux triomphes de l'idée byzantine, le miracle byzantin qui nous frappe le plus aujourd'hui; la grandeur et la force de l'Empire et de son Eglise n'apparaissent à aucun moment dans une lumière plus surnaturelle, plus mystique que dans ces années d'effondrement et de démembrement, où le patriarche oecuménique réfugié à Nicée dans un exil précaire voit les églises serbes et bulgares lui demander la reconnaissance et l'investiture. Etonnante fidélité des Slaves balkaniques au centre religieux d'où leur est venu la foi, fidélité quand même en dépit du malheur de l'Empire et de luttes inexpiables et fratricides!

Il faudrait un juge plus compétent que le signataire de ce compte rendu pour louer dignement le dernier chapitre. "Verfall und Untergang des byzantinischen Reiches" (première sub-division: "Byzanz als Kleinstaat: Andronikos II"). Ostrogorsky écrivant à Belgrade et admirablement au fait des sources sérieuses, a naturellement écrit des pages excellentes, les meilleures du livre sans doute (358–385) sur: "Die serbische Vorherrschaft auf dem Balkan."

Je n'aurai pas, en présence d'un instrument de travail qui constitue le plus clair de ma bibliothèque de byzantiniste en exil, et dont je puis dire qu'il m'a bien souvent, pendant ces dernières années rendu le goût de nos chères études et l'espoir de les reprendre quelque jour plus activement, en contact constant comme naguère avec des camarades dont Ostrogorsky est l'un des plus sûrs et l'un des meilleurs, je n'aurai pas, dis-je, la mesquinerie de relever des fautes d'impression ou de soulever

des chicanes chronologiques et autres, d'autant plus, je le répète, que dans les controverses l'auteur a toujours fait preuve de cette courtoisie qui est la marque de son noble caractère, appliquant la maxime que je voudrais universelle: *in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus urbanitas.*[5]

HENRI GRÉGOIRE.

LLOYD B. HOLSAPPLE, *Constantine the Great*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1942. 8°, pp. 469. Trois illustrations, une carte.

Constantinople est sans contredit d'actualité, et par conséquent, Constantin, son "fondateur," doit l'être aussi. C'est ce qu'a pensé M. Lloyd B. Holsapple, qui vient de donner au public américain un nouveau livre sur celui qu'on a trop souvent nommé "le premier empereur chrétien." Toutefois, à lire ce livre, à consulter sa bibliographie trop succincte (page 457 à 469), on a l'impression que l'ouvrage n'est pas très neuf. Sauf erreur, M. Holsapple ne cite jamais le *Constantin* de Piganiol, déjà vieux de dix ans, et même *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* de Norman H. Baynes, mentionné tout à la fin, p. 469, me semble avoir été découvert par l'écrivain un peu *in extremis*. Une autre adjonction de la dernière heure concerne mon propre travail sur la *Vita Constantini* du Pseudo-Eusèbe (p. 458). Or, au moment où Baynes publiait sa *Raleigh lecture*, la question constantinienne rebondissait, pour ainsi parler. Des faits nouveaux étaient mis en lumière. Des textes éloquents étaient redécouverts. L'histoire la plus contemporaine, la plus actuelle, illuminait un passé après tout très peu lointain, je veux dire infiniment près de nous. La légende, une fois de plus, et cette fois (peut-on l'espérer?) pour toujours, reculait décidément devant une vérité aveuglante. De toutes les discussions, aussi animées que fécondes, qui se sont engagées à partir de 1931 autour de son héros, il ne semble pas que M. Holsapple ait eu connaissance. C'est aussi singulier que regrettable, vu l'intérêt et même l'enthousiasme qu'il semble témoigner pour son sujet. Aux spécialistes, il paraîtra à peine croyable que M. Holsapple, écrivant ou du moins publiant son livre en 1942, ignore encore l'étymologie très peu mystérieuse, aujourd'hui généralement adoptée, du mot *labarum*. Pourtant, dès 1929, M. Baynes reconnaissait que "la vieille énigme était résolue," et que *labarum* n'était qu'une déformation grecque de

[5] J'entends dire que le livre décevrait parce que l'accent n'y est pas mis sur l'histoire économique. Mais il ne faut pas oublier que le volume de Dölger devait traiter à fond ces questions économiques et d'ailleurs, dans les notes comme dans le texte d'Ostrogorsky je trouve un grand nombre de véritables excursus sur les monnaies et les prix des denrées, comme il fallait s'y attendre après le mémoire spécial que l'auteur a consacré à ces matières.

laurum, le sens étant "l'étendard à la laurea, surmonté d'une couronne de laurier." Ce détail lexicographique est d'importance. La couronne de laurier n'avait rien de spécifiquement chrétien, on s'en doute. Le symbole constantinien par excellence est, comme on dirait en Amérique, *non-denominational*. Tout le monde est aujourd'hui d'accord sur un point: la lettre X, accompagnée ou non d'un I ou d'un P qui, au centre de la *laurea*, signifiait le Christ pour les soldats chrétiens, était, pour les autres, le chiffre 10, c'est à dire les dix années de règne qu'on souhaitait à l'empereur (*vota*). La première vision de Constantin, la seule, en réalité, qui soit attestée directement par un texte contemporain, est une vision païenne. En 310, en Gaule, le jeune empereur, ayant vaincu et tué son beau-père Maximien, voit dans un temple Apollon et la Victoire qui lui présentent tous deux la promesse de trente années de vie: trois fois le signe X dans une couronne de laurier, comme sur les monnaies. Le songe de Constantin chez Lactance (texte de 322 ou 23), la vision fantastique rapportée par le Pseudo-Eusèbe (fin du IV^{e} siècle au plus tôt), ne sont que des versions christianisées de l'apparition originale. (Cet adjectif est ironique sous ma plume, car il s'agit, tout le monde s'en rend compte, d'un lieu commun oratoire du panégyriste gaulois de 310). Je m'excuse de rappeler tout cela à M. Holsapple, à ses lecteurs et aux nôtres. Mais aussi pourquoi le sympathique historien n'a-t-il point pris la peine de relire ces Panégyriques si doctement et si spirituellement commentés par M. Pichon dans un livre admirable et, bien entendu, à peu près ignoré en Amérique? Puisque j'en suis aux symboles ambi-valents et interconfessionnels, qu'on me permette de rapprocher du *labarum* la grenade flamboyante de nos grenadiers belges, attachée au drapeau tricolore en 1914, et qui pour les croyants figurait le Sacré Cœur; et le monument bruxellois aux artilleurs morts pendant la guerre de 1914 à 1918, avec sa sainte Barbe à la palme où les officiers franc-maçons ne voulaient voir qu'une Victoire païenne.

J'en ai trop dit pour que le lecteur n'ait pas compris, déjà, que ce nouveau Constantin, loin d'être *up to date*, est conforme à la fable convenue, et que le portrait qu'on présente n'a guère profité des gains sérieux réalisés, dans ce compartiment de la science historique, par un groupe de chercheurs arrivés indépendamment aux mêmes constatations. L'auteur de ce compte rendu se doute de la principale raison de ce conservatisme, là où il ne s'explique point uniquement par ignorance de la littérature la plus récente. L'auteur, je le dis avec beaucoup de respect, paraît être un catholique convaincu, un converti très sincère, qui visiblement fait effort pour conserver les linéaments de l'histoire constantinienne tracés par le cardinal Baronius. Mais il oublie que Constantin n'est pas un saint de l'Eglise de Rome. En 1931, ceux

qui niaient la conversion de Constantin en 312 recevaient les félicitations et les encouragements d'un savant jésuite, professeur à l'Institut pontifical de Rome. M. Holsapple a eu grand tort d'antidater, à l'ancienne mode, la dite conversion (chap. VII); il a eu tort aussi (chap. VIII) de parler de l'Edit de Milan, puisqu'il est prouvé depuis longtemps que le document connu sous ce titre est de Licinius et fut promulgué à Nicomédie et non pas à Milan, au printemps de 313 et non pas au début de la même année. Ici, je serais presque tenté de mettre en doute "la candeur" de M. Holsapple. Car son récit des faits est certainement de nature à tromper le lecteur bénévole. Prenons son chapitre X intitulé *Constantine and Licinius*. Nous y trouvons une relation d'après Lactance de la marche de Licinius vers les détroits, où son rival Maximin venant d'Asie Mineure l'avait devancé. M. Holsapple, je le reconnais, n'esquive pas le grand témoignage de la meilleure des sources: "On this occasion, we are told by Lactantius, Licinius was taught by an angel in a dream a prayer which he was to recite together with his whole army before entering the conflict, while Daia is reported as vowing to Jupiter that, should he grant him the victory, he would exterminate and utterly blot out the very name of the Christians." Plus loin il traduit l'admirable prière latine au *Summus Deus*. Pourquoi ne pas conclure, avec Lactance, que la victoire du *Campus Ergenus*, dont M. Holsapple oublie de nous donner la date sûre, est la première victoire chrétienne, c'est-à-dire remportée par un empereur divinement inspiré, docile aux ordres de la divinité et livrant bataille au nom du Très Haut? Pourquoi? La raison donnée par M. Holsapple est tout à fait curieuse: "The parallel with Constantine's dream, as well as the fact that the prayer suggests the one which Eusebius reports as prescribed by Constantine for the use of his soldiers, both being sufficiently vague to be possible for both pagans and Christians to use, cast serious doubts on the trustworthiness of the narrative." J'ai relu plusieurs fois cette phrase que je ne suis pas bien sûr de comprendre. Si l'on compare dans Lactance le long développement sur l'ange et la prière de Licinius et, en général, toute l'histoire si vivante, si trépidante de la défaite et de la fuite de Maximin et de l'entrée du vainqueur à Nicomédie où l'attendait Lactance, si l'on compare, dis-je, ce récit d'un témoin direct, oculaire même, avec la courte phrase sur le songe de Constantin, dont nous avons démontré l'origine païenne, on se rendra à l'évidence: pour Lactance en 321, en 322 encore, le premier empereur chrétien, celui qui reçoit d'angéliques visites et qui affranchit définitivement les fidèles d'Asie de la peur, c'est Licinius. La belle prière que l'ange lui dicta est, il est vrai, attribuée à Constantin. Mais par qui? par ce louche Pseudo-Eusèbe dont la compilation, ignorée de S. Jérôme, ne commençait à être citée qu'au début du V^{e} siècle. M.

Holsapple ne traite pas ses sources selon les principes de la saine méthode historique. Et voilà pourquoi, au lieu d'écrire l'histoire, il se borne à reproduire je ne sais quelle hagiographie. Mais voici qui est plus fâcheux. Au lieu de nous parler de ce grand acte, l'Edit de Tolérance de Nicomédie, le principal titre de gloire de Licinius après tout, M. Holsapple, p. 216, se borne à écrire: "Immediately after his victory over Daia, Licinius issued from Nicomedia the version of the Edict of Milan, to which we have already referred."

La méthode est toujours la même. Chaque fois que le témoignage de la source contemporaine est en contradiction avec la légende tardive, on abandonne la première pour suivre la seconde. On semble oublier que la légende de l'Edit de Milan ne se trouve même pas dans les vies les plus fabuleuses de Constantin, qu'elle remonte tout au plus au cardinal Baronius, lequel ignorait encore le *De mortibus persecutorum* de Lactance, découvert et publié par Baluze à la fin du XVII[e] siècle. C'est Voltaire qui a raison, le Voltaire du *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. Si Licinius n'avait été vaincu et tué par son beau-frère Constantin en 324, c'est lui et non Constantin qui serait célébré comme le héros de l'histoire chrétienne, et tout le monde saurait par cœur la prière angélique au *Summus Deus*. Cela ne veut pas dire que Constantin ne soit pas un grand homme. Dans la lutte suprême entre les deux religions quelque chose lui appartient qui vaut mieux que l'initiative: la décision. Mais la science moderne ne doit pas se laisser influencer par une *damnatio memoriae* qui prive Licinius de sa part, laquelle est grande, dans le triomphe de la tolérance religieuse. Il imposa [1] l'Edit de Sardique (311) qui mit fin à la phase vraiment cruelle de la dernière persécution, et rien ne nous autorise à lui refuser la paternité de l'Edit de Nicomédie, plus large et plus libéral encore, où il invoque, il est vrai, son accord avec Constantin, mais qui répond aux besoins immédiats de sa politique particulière. *Is fecit cui prodest.* D'ailleurs, l'*Historia Augusta* nous dit de lui qu'il prétendait descendre de l'empereur Philippe l'Arabe; or à cette époque [2] Philippe était assez généralement vénéré pour avoir été, plus de soixante ans avant Constantin et Licinius, le tout premier empereur chrétien. Son nom était donc, comme on dit, un programme. En terminant, je me permets de renvoyer M. Holsapple à l'*Histoire de l'Eglise* de Fliche et Martin, où nos collègues Zeiller et Palanque ont très consciencieusement mis au point les problèmes effleurés ici et, semble-t-il, ignorés, délibérement ou non, par notre auteur, lequel nous paraît un *vir timidus scribendi peritus.*

HENRI GRÉGOIRE.

[1] A Galère agonisant.
[2] Vers 360 après J. Chr.

PETER CHARANIS, *The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518.* Madison, Wisconsin (1939).

This book contains a very useful record of the events of an important turning-point in the political and religious history of the Eastern Empire. It is written in a limpid style, with a clear understanding of the factors which proved decisive in the somewhat confused struggles of this time. In controversial questions the author shows a reasonable judgment and in general an intelligent comprehension of the political factors which directed Anastasius's decisions. Therefore the small book will probably remain for some time the best monograph not only on "the religious policy of Anastasius the First," but also on the general history of this Emperor. It is perhaps for bookselling purposes that the title is preceded by another: "Church and state in the Later Roman Empire," which, in its unlimited formulation, may easily be misunderstood; it should at least have been printed in smaller characters than the chief title which restricts the indeterminate first one by indicating the real subject of the book.

In an introductory chapter, the religious situation in the second half of the fifth century is shortly described as it resulted from the different dogmatic controversies of the Eastern Church, principally from the conflicts between the defenders of the Chalcedonian creed and their Nestorian and Monophysite opponents. "The social and religious background of Anastasius" (p. 10–13) explains in some measure his attitude as ruler of the Empire. The author shows that his policy was chiefly influenced by the desire to accomplish his predecessor Zenon's aim of reconciling the different religious parties, an aim which found expression in the famous decree of 482 A.D., known commonly as Zenon's *Henotikon.* Though in the course of time some minor changes can be discerned in the religious policy of Emperor Anastasius, his attitude was always inspired by the desire to end the religious struggle by compromise. The author's judgment on Anastasius's policy is similar to that of Eduard Schwartz; he avoids, however, some gross exaggerations of this scholar, who explained almost all currents in Church History by the malignity and the intrigues of the outstanding personalities. As a matter of fact, the attitude of Anastasius in religious questions was largely influenced by his relations with the papacy (p. 19 ff.) and by the discontent which rose in the Western provinces, when he favored the Monophysites in the East. Especially during the dangerous revolts of Vitalian, the old Emperor showed a remarkable lack of steadiness and a striking readiness to break his promises at the very first occasion, when the danger was over. Mr. Charanis contents himself with registering this fact; he neither apologizes nor condemns. The events in Syria before and during the

triumph of the Monophysite party in the East and the revolts of Vitalian are recorded in detail according to the original sources. In the final chapter it is showed how the last negotiations with the papacy were influenced by these political and religious struggles which threatened the security, sometimes even the existence of the Empire. The historical part of the book closes with the death of Anastasius. The author throws a view in the events that follow, but his remarks are very brief; even the victory of the Chalcedonian party and the deposition of Severus and his adherents, the immediate consequences of the Emperor's death, are not mentioned. The blank of p. 77 would perhaps have sufficed for adding a small epilogue corresponding to the useful introduction.

But Professor Charanis probably thinks that the last paragraph of this same *Introduction* makes up for the lack of epilogue. Here it is (page 9): "He sought his own solution, one that would satisfy the Eastern provinces, the really vital parts of the empire. It is this aspect of his religious policy that makes it worthy of serious study. For had it succeeded, it might have reunited the Christian East and made it an invulnerable barrier against the Arabs, with far reaching consequences for the history of the Near East and Europe. But the death of Anastasius eventually brought to the throne a far different personality, one whose ideology led him to sacrifice the East for the West, with the result that the religious struggle continued to its logical conclusion — the ultimate loss of the Eastern provinces by the empire."

We have thought it necessary to reprint Charanis' own words, because they clearly show that, despite his scholarly self-restraint and this concentration on a well-limited subject, he really views this chapter of Byzantine "religious history" as a chapter of world history. Of course, the question immediately arises whether "the far different personality" or "personalities" of Justin and Justinian really "sacrificed the East for the West." One could argue that, after all, the problem with which Justinian — and Theodora — were confronted was exactly the same, and that they tried to solve it much in the same way as Anastasius. Very few indeed among the Byzantine Emperors were not placed before a tragic dilemma of the same sort. Professor Peter Charanis, who, since his "magistral coup d'essai," has given us several excellent papers on the Palaeologi,[1] always wavering between East and West, will certainly

[1] The following papers were written after the completion of Charanis' Thesis on Emperor Anastasius, reviewed above: "Les Βραχέα Χρονικά comme Source Historique," *Byzantion*, XIII, fasc. 1, p. 335; "Coronation and its Constitutional Significance in the Later Roman Empire," *Byzantion*, XV, 49; "Internal Strife at Byzantium in the Fourteenth Century," *Byzantion*, XV, 208; "The Strife among the Palaeologi and the Ottoman Turks, 1370–1402," *Byzantion* XVI, Fasc. 1, p. 286;

have been struck by the constant ἀνάγκη of Byzantine history, an ἀνάγκη begotten by geography itself. And all the criticism contained in this article simply means that the reviewers are disappointed by the "premature" closing of this good book. It may be suggested that after this first successful attempt it would probably be an easy task for the author to write an exhaustive history which would keep the promise made by the first title of the actual book: "Church and State in the Later Roman Empire." In the hope that this desire will be fulfilled, I make here a number of minor additions, consisting especially in references to several recent European publications. My remarks may also contribute to completing the very important appendices of the book, viz. the extensive "note on the sources" and the bibliography, which, together with a detailed index, renders valuable services to the readers.

(P. 14, n. 23) The last and best edition of the text of the *Henotikon* based chiefly upon a Greek Ms. of Rossano, was published by Ed. Schwartz, "Codex Vatic. gr. 1431, eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.*, philos.-philol.-hist. Kl., XXXII, 6. Abh. (Munich, 1927), pp. 49–51. We owe to the same scholar the first critical edition of the *Breviarium* by Liberatus, published in his *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, t. II, vol. V: "Collectio Sangermanensis" (Berlin-Leipzig, 1936), p. 98, 5–141, 13 (the translation of the *Henotikon* is there on p. 127, 17–129, 2).

I do not agree with this sentence (p. 17): "There was some Monophysitic sentiment in Isauria and Phrygia, more especially in Phrygia, where the 'anti-imperial, anti-Constantinopolitan, provincial, centrifugal, and Anatolian' city of Hierapolis was a rallying point for heretics." As to Phrygia, the author follows here *bona fide* the statements of the late Sir William M. Ramsay, which have generally been accepted. In this same volume of *Byzantion* (above pp. 75–77) I have showed that they are wrong. We can on the contrary affirm that to our knowledge there are no traces of Monophysitism in Phrygia.

The spelling Mabbögh (p. 29.34.39) or Mäbbogh (p. 101) is not justified; the name of the city was simply Mabbog(h) with a short o, as is proved by the Arabic spelling Manbij.

In the quotation of Michel's Syriac Chronicle (p. 31, n. 94) read 2: 160 instead of 1: 160 (quoted afterwards as *op. cit.*, without indication of the vol. on p. 40 f., n. 24; p. 41, n. 28; p. 47, n. 58).

(P. 32; cf. p. 36) "Nephalios, a monk attached to the patriarchate of

---

"The Greek Historical Sources of the Second Half of the Fourteenth Century," *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, January, 1944, p. 406.

Jerusalem, formerly a Monophysite but now an adherent of the Council of Chalcedon" is not quite correct. Nephalios, an Alexandrine monk who agitated first against his patriarch Peter and afterwards in the interest of the clergy of Jerusalem, remained always a schismatic Monophysite, though persecuting the Monophysite monks in Palestine (cf. Zachar. Rhet. continuat., "Hist. Eccl.," VI, 2, *Corp. Script. Christ. Orient.* [=*CSCO*], Scr. Syri, ser. III, t. VI, textus p. 4, versio p. 2).

In the midst of p. 39 we read: "Similar sentiments against the patriarch were expressed by Severus and Julian, bishops of Halicarnassus in Caria, who were also in Constantinople." But the Severus in question is the future patriarch of Antioch, who at this time (509–511) was still monk.

Concerning the Synod of Sidon (p. 44, n. 41), the two groups of sources are indeed contradictory, but perhaps less incompatible than it seems at first sight. For though the number of Philoxenos's adherents was very small, he was supported by the Emperor, who probably ordered to break up this assembly just because it had not taken the desired course. It must be noticed that soon after the closure of the synod, Philoxenos went with his monks to Constantinople in order to inform the Emperor of the events at Sidon and of "the fact that Flavian was an heretic"; he returned to Syria with a mandate by the Emperor to expel Flavian (Zach. Rhet. contin., VII, 10, textus p. 51, 4–7; versio p. 35, 10–13). This sojourn of Philoxenos in Cple. should have been mentioned at the end of p. 46.

It is not likely that the election of Severus was achieved by the use of gold (p. 47). Both Chalcedonians and Monophysites reproached each other often with this procedure. In the letters of Severus himself we find several times the same reproach against his Chalcedonian opponents.

In my opinion "ecclesia orientalis" (p. 51, n. 2) can only mean the Antiochene patriarchate, as Caspar understands it. But of course the letter to the bishops of Illyricum, written Oct. 8, 512, cannot be "an indirect answer to that of the Oriental church" (E. Caspar, *Gesch. d. Papstt.*, II, p. 123), if the latter was written after November 512, as Caspar seems to assume according to p. 121, n. 6.

(p. 55, last section) "The emperor forbade the celebration of certain festivities." Charanis alludes to the *πανήγυρις τῆς Γάστρης*. The name of this celebration, which puzzled Eduard Schwartz (*Publ. Samml. z. acacian. Schisma*, p. 252, n. 2), relates obviously to the monastery of *Γάστρια*, founded by Helena, Constantine's mother.

The facts (insubordination of the bishops of Syria II) recorded on p. 69 according to the letter to Alcison (ap. Euagr. III 33 f.) and on

p. 71 according to the letters of Severus, point to the same events of 515 A.D., though Severus mentions a third bishop of Syria II, that of Rhaphaneia. It would better be said that these bishops "declared Severus deposed" instead of "deposed Severus," for they were hardly entitled to act so against their own patriarch, defying moreover an assembly of Oriental bishops gathered at this time at Antioch.

According to Charanis (p. 70) the bishops of Syria II took part in the synod of Tyre. "Zach. Rhet.," who speaks twice about this synod, mentions indeed in the second passage the "bishops of the region (χώρα) of Antioch and Apamea," but omits Apamea in the first (*loc. cit.*, textus p. 51, 16 and 55, 18; versio, p. 35, 22 and 38, 18). John of Ephesos also (*Patrol. Orient.* II, p. 304 f.) mentions Apamea as the only city-name beside five names of provinces. Obviously the metropolitan of Apamea was the only representative of this province. Brooks assumed that after 515 A.D. the Chalcedonians were treated more severely than before, while Charanis advocates the opposite alternative viz., that some concessions may have been made to the opposition. I do not know whether the sources contain any unequivocal statement justifying either of these hypotheses. I conjecture that the "needed reforms" effected at Tyre concerned rather the question, much discussed at this time, whether the names of the bishops who had taken part in the Council of Chalcedon should be erased from the sacred diptychs, or a more conciliatory attitude (οἰκονομία instead of ἀκρίβεια) should be adopted in this point.

(p. 73 in fine) The delegates of the monks of Syria II arrived at Constantinople hardly already "toward the close of 516," since they appealed to the pope only at the end of 517 (p. 74 above). E. Caspar (*loc. cit.*, II, 147, n. 2) seems to be right dating the complaints at Constantinople of autumn 517. The passage of Victor Tonnennensis, quoted p. 74, n. 1, refers to a letter from Transjordania which certainly had no relation to the events in Syria II.

I do not agree with the author in his assertion (p. 81) that Zacharias Scholasticus "wrote to refute the charge that Severus had been a pagan in his youth and his work therefore lacks objectivity." It is very unlikely that Severus ever had been a pagan, for he was the grandson of the homonymous bishop of Sozopolis in 431 A.D.; moreover, baptizing of adults is attested as a Pisidian usage, which of course could easily be interpreted by the opponents of Severus in a malicious way.

(p. 82, n. 2) Besides the chief work of Lebon, his complete edition and translation of the fragments of the most important letters of Philoxenos should have been mentioned ("Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabboug," *Le Muséon*, XLIII [1930], p. 17–84; 149–220).

(p. 83, n. 3 and p. 94) It seems that at present most of the competent scholars agree that Zacharias Scholasticus was the author of both the *Life of Severus* and the *Chronicle*; his identification with Bishop Zacharias of Mitylene, member of the council at Constantinople in 536 A.D. is, according to Eduard Schwartz, "platterdings unmöglich" (*Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, p. 367, n. 1).

(p. 83) The *Church History* of Zacharias comprised only the period from 450 until 491 A.D.; excerpts of this work were inserted in an anonymous Syriac "World History," comprising the years 439–40 until 568–9 A.D. Therefore the history of the time of Anastasius is written by the anonymous author.

(p. 85) It could be mentioned that, according to J. Haury, John Malalas was the same as John Scholastikos, Patriarch of Constantinople (*Byz. Ztschr.*, IX [1900], p. 337–356); Louis Petit (*Dict. Théol. Cath.* VIII [1924], p. 829–831) shared this opinion without hesitation, and F. Dölger also declared it probable (*Lexikon f. Theol. und Kirche*, V [Freiburg i. B., 1933], col. 530 f.).

(p. 87 and 92) The full title of the quoted work of Schwartz is *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma.*

(p. 89) The remark concerning Mgr Duchesne's posthumous continuation of his admirable *Church History* seems to me undeserved, though in the case of the policy of Anastasius the criticism against his judgment may be justified.

(Bibliography, p. 91) It would be preferable to insert the books of Baronius and Grumel among the modern works.

(p. 92) The *Panegyricus* of Priscian has been re-edited by Baehrens in his *Poetae Latini minores* (Leipzig, 1883), p. 264–274, that of Procopius of Gaza by Carolus Kempen, *Procopii Gazaei In imperatorem Anastasium panegyricus* (Diss. Bonn, 1918). Some new fragments of Theodore Lector's *Church History*, found in *Cod. Vatop. 250*,[2] fols. 210–218, have been published by A. Papadopulos-Kerameus, "Νέα τεμάχη τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου Ἀναγνώστου τοῦ Ἐντολέως." *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveščenija*, t. CCCXXXIII (1901), Otd. klass. Philol., p. 1–24. (p. 93) The last edition (with Latin translation) of the *Chronicle of Edessa* is that of Ignazio Guidi in *CSCO*, Scr. Syri, Ser. III, t. IV (Paris, 1903), textus p. 1–13; versio p. 3–11. (p. 94) The article *Anastase* by L. Bréhier in the *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques*, II (Paris 1914), col. 1447–1457, deserves mention. A third edition of the book of R. Duval appeared Paris, 1907. Besides this work and that of McLean (p. 95), the *Histories of Syriac*

[2] In fact cod. 286, cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl*, vol. A10, coll. 1869–1881, s.v. (48) Theodoros Anagnostes.

Literature by A. Baumstark (Bonn, 1922) and J. B. Chabot (Paris, 1934) could have been mentioned.

The Index, though thoroughly elaborated, can be completed by some items (Acra 54 f. Cosmas, bishop of Epiphania 69. Diodore of Tarse 35. Eutyches, condemned also by Severus 47. Huns, see Saberoi. Peter the Iberian 33. Severianus (1): add 58; (2) of Arethusa 69. Tarrach, a Hun 64. Theodoret of Cyrus 35).

ERNEST HONIGMANN AND H. G.

O. HALECKI, *The Crusade of Varna: a Discussion of Controversial Problems* (Polish Institute Series, No. 3), New York, 1943. Pp. 96.

The crusade of Varna was the last concerted effort to check the expansion of the Ottoman Turks in Europe, and to push them back into Asia Minor. As it belongs to general history, for the successful issue of it would have had tremendous consequences for Europe, it has attracted the attention of many historians. One point in particular has been the subject of much discussion: the treaty of Szeged and its denunciation by the Hungarian-Polish king, Ladislas the Jagiellonian, the leader of the Christian forces, only a few days after he had agreed to it. According to the generally accepted view, Ladislas, despite his promise to launch a crusade against the Ottomans, came to terms with them and signed the treaty of Szeged; the ink of his signature was hardly dry, however, when he denounced the treaty, under the pressure of the papal legate, Julian Cesarini, who was bent upon the undertaking of the crusade. The king abandoned what appeared an advantageous treaty and plunged into a hopeless enterprise that ended in disaster for his army and death for himself.

The little volume that has just been published by O. Halecki, the distinguished Polish historian, is devoted entirely to a reexamination of this problem and seriously challenges the traditional view. Halecki has examined all the contemporary evidence and has come to the conclusion that there was no treaty of Szeged. A treaty was indeed rejected at Szeged, but this treaty had been concluded two months before and not at Szeged. It had been agreed upon in Adrianople by Murad and the delegates of Ladislas, Hunyadi, the despot of Transylvania, and Brankovich, the despot of Serbia, but it was not to go into effect unless it were ratified by the king. At Szeged on August 4, the young king simply refused to ratify this treaty, and announced his crusade against the Turks.

The general soundness of Halecki's view cannot be doubted. It is based on newly discovered contemporary evidence, namely a series of

letters by the Italian humanist Cyriacus of Ancona, who was in Adrianople at the time of the negotiations between Murad and the delegates of Ladislas, Hunyadi and Brankovich. It is now clear that there was no treaty of Szeged; that the treaty denounced there was that concluded at Adrianople. But it is questionable if this discovery adds to the stature of Ladislas as Halecki would have it. The king obviously vacillated in his policy toward the Ottomans. In June of 1444 he was for peace and acted accordingly as the treaty of Adrianople definitely shows; by August of the same year he changed his mind and declared for the crusade. Brankovich and Hunyadi may have been responsible for the policy of Adrianople; Julian Cesarini for that of Szeged, but the fact is that the king did not know his own mind and the delay caused by his vacillations was mainly responsible, as Halecki points out, for the failure at Varna.

In an article published in 1932 (*Byzantion*, VII, 41–67) Halecki threw part of the blame for the failure at Varna on Byzantium, urging that despite the urgent appeals of its emperor for help, it rendered only a limited assistance to Ladislas. He now declares, however, "that, without waiting for the Hungarians to march against the enemy, the Greeks were the first who fulfilled their task by attacking the Turks from the Peloponnesus, gaining considerable successes." The Greeks did not fail the western Christians, the western Christians failed the Greeks. The failure at Varna, according to Halecki, must be attributed to the delay caused by the negotiations at Adrianople; the neutrality of Brankovich; the incompetency of the command of the allied fleet; the help which the Genoese gave to the Turks to cross the Bosphorus, and a violent wind which impeded the allied fleet, but aided the enemy.

The book is an important contribution to the history of eastern Europe. Its value is enhanced by the inclusion of the letters of Cyriacus of Ancona referring to the peace negotiations in Adrianople, carefully edited and arranged.

PETER CHARANIS.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY.

NOTES ON SOME GREEK PAPYRI

By ANGELO SEGRÈ

I. P. MICHIGAN INV. 4703, A MARRIAGE CONTRACT OF A VETERAN OF THE CLASSIS ALEXANDRINA

P. Michigan inv. 4703 (second half of the second cent. A.D.) has been published by H. A. Sanders as a marriage certificate in diploma form.[1] Some peculiarities of the contract which had not been explained

[1] H. A. Sanders, "A Soldier Marriage Certificate in Diploma Form," *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.*, LXXXI (1939), 581–90 and Plates I-II.

by Sanders lead R. O. Fink to reinterpret the deed as the *sponsalia* of a *classiarius*.[2]

The reinterpretation of Fink is not correct, while the interpretation of Sanders is in the main accurate. The revised P Michigan reads:[3]

Probably one line lost
[.....] ci filia Demetria [---ca 13---] s . um consist (ens) Col(oniae)
2. [C]ae[sareae] ann(orum) XXXVIIII corpore fusco fa[c]ie [d]e[du]cta naso recto lentigo malo
3. d[e]xtro tutore auctore Glaucippo Anniani consist(ente) Col(oniae) Caesar-
(eae) ann(orum) XXXXVIII, cor —
4. pore fusco, facie deducta naso recto, subcalvo, cicatrice supra super[ci]lium sinistrum C(aio) Valerio Gemello mil(iti) class[i]s Aug(ustae) Alexandrinae,
6. liburni Dracontis, cui ante nupta erat, ex quo matrimonio filios pro —
7. creaverunt, Iustum annorum XIIII, Gemellum annorum X, eique dotis suae
8. nomine dixit deditque in aestimio vestis et in numerato praesens
9. ...[.].[..]..... as duas d[rachma]s quam dotem dixit se is Valeri[us] Ge —
10. [mellus accepisse .....]

There is difficulty in the new reading in l. 3 where *pacta est* was first read instead of *dextro*.

The verb in the first sentence is missing; I suppose it to have been a verb such as e.g., *nupta est*: I do not know whether the verb may be inserted in l. 3 instead of *pacta est*, or in l. 1.

With the new corrections the text reads:

Date, place, Demetria daughter of . . . , a resident of the colony of Caesarea, thirty-nine years old, of dark complexion, with a long face, straight nose and a spot on her right cheek assisted by her guardian Glaucippus, son of Annianus, a resident of the colony of Caesarea, forty-eight years old of dark complexion, with a long face, and straight nose who is somewhat bald and has a scar over his left eyebrow, agrees to marry Gaius Valerius Gemellus a soldier of the imperial Alexandrian Fleet on the liburna Dragon. She was his wife and from this marriage two sons were born, Justus fourteen and Gemellus ten. She has assigned and delivered to him her dowry, clothing at a fixed valuation and a sum in ready money counted out, . . . and two drachmas. The said Valerius Gemellus acknowledges the receipt of this dowry. . . .

The deed had been redacted in Caesarea of Mauretania, Cherchel.[4] To understand correctly the text we state as premises:

(a) that Roman soldiers during the military service were not allowed to marry,
(b) that they used to live in concubinate with women whom they usually married after the honesta missio when granted conubium with their concubines,

[2] R. O. Fink, "The *Sponsalia* of a *Classiarius*: a Reinterpretation of *P. Mich. inv. 4703*," *Trans. Amer. Philol. Asso.*, LXXII (1941), 109–124.
[3] R. O. Fink, *loc. cit.*, p. 109 f.
[4] Colonia Claudia Caesarea, Roman colonia since Claudius (Plin., nat. hist., V,

(c) that the women with whom the soldiers lived were called uxores even in the military diplomas which granted conubium to the soldiers also before their legitimate marriage.

In the case of C. V. Gemellus, he was granted the privilege of *veterani classiarii*. They were granted Roman citizenship with their sons and conubium with their concubines with the formula: "quorum nomina subscripta sunt ipsis filiisque eorum quos susceperint ex mulieribus quas secum concessa consuetudine vixisse probaverint civitatem Romanam dedit et conubium cum iisdem quas tunc secum habuissent cum iis quas postea uxores duxissent dumtaxat singuli singulas."

And now to the history of the marriage of Gemellus and Demetria. C. V. Gemellus, possibly an Alexandrian, less probably a *metropolita*, enlisted in the navy when he was 18 years old. About 10 years later he met Demetria, and they began to live together in concubinate. Demetria was then about 24 years old. She bore her first son Iustus at 25, her second son, Gemellus, at 29, both very probably registered with a *testatio* as illegitimate sons of a soldier.[5] After 25 years' service C. V. Gemellus received the *honesta missio*. He is 43 years old and Demetria 39; they marry and they enjoy the privileges of the *honesta missio*.[6]

The marriage took place in Caesarea immediately after the discharge of Gemellus. After the marriage, C. V. Gemellus and his family went back to Egypt where this document, their marriage certificate, was found.

Have we now to refute the reinterpretation of *P. Mich. inv. 4703* given by O. R. Fink? He supposed, p. 121, that Gemellus had married Demetria before the enlistment and thereby broken the marriage.[7]

To assure Demetria that he was willing to remarry her as soon as possible, i.e., after 25 years of military service spent in the navy, he had made a contract of betrothal, Latin *sponsalia*. But our text has nothing to do with *sponsalia*. Fink supposes further that the man who drafted the so called *sponsalia* was "a man with a considerable practical knowledge of Roman law and a shrewd eye to the best means of meeting the exigencies of the special circumstances in which Gemellus and Demetria were placed."

---

20), see Dessau, *R.E.*, s.v. Caesarea Mauretaniae. Ships of the Egyptian and of the Syrian fleet in the haven of Caesarea Mauretaniae (Cagnat, *L'armée d'Afrique*, pp. 338, 345 f.) in the second century A.D. See Fiebiger, *R.E.*, s.v. classis p. 2641 f.: Weinstock, *R.E.*, s.v. Mauretania, p. 2385; Lesquier, *L'armée Romaine*, p. 100. Moreover, at the time of our document the classis Misensis was stationed at Caesarea in Palestine, P.S.I. 1026 (150 A.D.).

[5] For all this see A. Segrè, "Il diritto dei militari peregrini nell' esercito Romano," *Rend. Pont. Acc. Rom. d'Arch.*, XVII (1940–41), 169 ff.

[6] See A. Segrè, *ibid.*, p. 178 ff.

[7] See p. 566.

The modest writer of the marriage contract in Caesarea did not deserve so much praise; it belongs to Professor R. O. Fink.[8]

2. W. L. WESTERMANN, "TUSCUS THE PREFECT AND THE *veterani* IN EGYPT (P. YALE INV. 1528 AND P. FOUAD 21)," CLASS. PHIL., XXVI (1941), 21–29

This article appeared shortly after A. Segrè, "P. Yale inv. 1528 and P. Fouad 21," *J.R.St.* (1940), p. 153 f. The conclusions of the two articles are nearly the same: that they belong to the same protocol, that the soldiers are veterans, that ἀγωγή in P. Yale inv. 1528 means *actio*, but Westermann translated *actio* inaccurately by "procedure." Ἀγωγή = *actio* = claim and is not even a new word in the papyri of the early Imperial age; see, e.g., P. Oxy. 1408, 3; P.S.I. 288, 12; P. Oxy. 2111 (135 A.D.). The correction of Westermann in P. Yale 1508 μὴ λέγετε ἀσεβὲς [π]ρᾶγμα into τάραγμα is not acceptable. It makes the reading worse; moreover, the space in brackets is only enough for one letter.

Westermann in his article did not try to explain the nature of the *beneficium* of the Emperor Nero. I had already shown that the difference between the position of the different veterans in the protocol of Tuscus could not be related to different rights of the veterans embodied in the military diplomas.[1]

The χάρις of Nero which provoked the rush of veterans to Alexandria was connected with the privileges given by grant of the citizenship. It is plain that the veterans had troubles with the strategi of the nomes [2] and that they were working in the interest of the Treasury;[3] if not, Tuscus would not have urged them back to their work with the words: μὴ γεῖσθε ἀργοί (sic!).

The *beneficium* of Nero may be explained probably on the basis of the evidence of B.G.U. III 747 = W., *Chrest.*, 35 (136 A.D.).[4] There Ptolemaeus, the *strategos* of the Coptites, complains to the prefect Avidius Heliodorus that the Romans, the Alexandrians and the veterans

[8] R. O. Fink, pp. 121 ff. assumes that in P. Cattaoui, col. IV = M. Chrest 372, p. 421 = P. M. Meyer, *Jurist. Pap.*, 22, p. 54 Chrotis, an ἀστή, had married Isidoros, an ἀστός, who, as soldier, took the name of Julius Martialis and that the enlistment of Isidoros had broken the marriage. He is mistaken. Chrotis began to live with Isidoros after he was enlisted. It is not probable that Isidoros had married Chrotis before he was 18 years old. Here also P. M. Meyer, *loc. cit.*, p. 54 seems incorrect. They had a son, illegitimate, but still ἀστός, since the registration of birth was effected with the ἀπαρχή. Martialis died and with his will left as heir his son (see A. Segrè, *Rend. Pont. Acc.*, XVII, 174 ff.).

[1] A. Segrè, *Rend. Pont. Acc. Rom. d'Arch.*, XVII (1941), 169 ff.
[2] P. Yale inv. 1528, l. 6–8.
[3] P. Fouad 21 l. 22 f.
[4] A. Segrè, *J.R. St.* (1940), p. 154.

who were in the public service refused to obey him, alleging that they were not in the same class with the native practores. They claimed not to be dependent on the *strategoi*. The prefect answered that the veterans in official duties had to obey the *epistrategoi*.

Very probably the work required from the veterans was related to their former activity as soldiers. Probably the *classiarii* helped in liturgies connected with the transport of wheat by boat to Alexandria; the soldiers of the alae had to do with the services of horses, donkeys, etc., the *legionarii* were selected for other works. Therefore the different sorts of *veterani* liable to the liturgies had different claims.[5]

3. ON THE METROLOGICAL MEANING OF A "DONKEY"

O. M. Pearl, in "Varia papyrologica," *Trans. Amer. Philol. Asso.*, LXXI (1941), 372 ff. enjoyed (p. 372) "the opportunity for penetrating more deeply into the metrological significance of 'donkey.'" To do so he criticized some conclusions on the capacity of the Graeco-Egyptian ceramia of A. Segrè, *Metrologia*, 1928. His criticisms lead him (p. 383) to conclude that "the approximate correspondence between the Egyptian wine-ceramion of 8 choes and the amphora romana which the traditional metrology attests may be reaffirmed."

Criticisms on my conclusions about the Egyptian ceramia had been discreetly formulated by a good scholar — Edgar, in P. Zen. IV 59741, 2 note. Pearl made no new metrological discovery. He did not even discover A. Segrè, "Nuovi appunti metrologici," *Symbolae Osloenses* XIII (Oslo, 1934), 68 ff., where it was proved that the ceramion of 6 choes was equal to the artaba of 40 choenices and that it was divided as follows:

ceramion of 6 choes	litres	29.11	1			
chous	"	4.852	6	1		
cotyla	"	1.213	24	4	1	
sextarius = hin	"	0.4852	60	10	2½	1

The donkeys of Pearl which carried 2 ceramia of wine each in the papyri of Aberdeen and in the Ostraka of Wadi Sarga [1] probably carried a

[5] In the Edict of Cyrene III (7/6 B.C.), the people of Cyrenaica, granted Roman citizenship, were liable to the liturgies as all the Hellenes. Only those who had been granted exemption through a law or a senatus consultus, or through a degree of Caesar, or those who had been granted by Augustus at the same time Roman citizenship and immunity were exempted from the liturgies. The exemption from the liturgies was limited to the property owned by the people at the moment of the grant. See A. V. Premerstein Sav. Z. 48, 1928, p. 466 ff.

[1] W. E. Crum and H. I. Bell, "Wadi Sarga — Coptic and Greek Texts," *Coptica* III, 1922.

weight corresponding to 200 Alexandrian pounds (see A. Segrè, *Metrologia* p. 30) or two measures of litres 34.93 of wine (see *Metrologia*, p. 32). In this case the ceramion carried by the donkeys of Wadi Sarga was a ceramion equal to the oil metretes of 12 choes equal to the medimnos of litres 34.93 weighing, full of water, a centenarion.

O. M. Pearl did not realize that the ceramion = amphora of the Romans, belonged to another metrological system than the Alexandrian measures and thus he missed the opportunity of penetrating deeper into the metrological significance of "donkey." [2]

4. P. BIBL. UN. GISS. 22

P. bibl. un. Giss. 22 refers to the sending by boat of Cnidian jars (*knidia*) full of money. The text would have a notable interest if we knew the capacity of the *knidia*, the sort of drachmas which filled the jars, and the date of the text. All these data remain conjectural. The text, however, deserves some attention, and needs elucidation even after the commentary of F. Heichelheim, which, incidentally, is of little use.

I think that from P. bibl. un. Giss. 22 we may conclude with a certain grade of probability that:

(a) The *knidia* were measures of very different capacity, as had already been shown by A. Segrè, *Metrologia* (1928), p. 507.[1] Here the *knidia* are probably of 4 Alexandrian *sextarii* (the small ones) and of 32 *sextarii* (the big ones).[2]

[2] Camels, in Edict Diocl. XVII, 4 (Tenney Frank, *Econ. Survey*, V, 369; Appendix by E. R. Grazer) carry 600 pounds, i.e., 1½ times as much as an Egyptian camel. Donkeys, XVII, 5, probably carry 300 pounds. But XIV, 9, a camel-load of wood is 200 pounds. The Hellenistic-Jewish *gomor*, the load of a donkey, was litres 109.1, the biblical *gomor* litres 104.8, the Assyrian *imēru* litres 100.4.

[1] Lionel Casson, in Trans. Amer. Philol. Asso., 70, 1939, p. 6, collected the following evidence for the capacity of the *knidion*: 4 *sextarii* in Wessely, P. Form. 358 = Form. 1168, 5 *sextarii* in Wessely, *Altersinditium* 28 and 35, and C.P.R., *Kopt. Texte*, CCXXXIV, and Wadi Sarga 87 (cf. p. 23). P. Oxy. 1820, 20, 22, 8 *sextarii*. P. Oxy. 1951, where the *knidion* is equal to a *diploun* which may have 4½, 6 or 8 *sextarii*. In the texts of Wadi Sarga, H. I. Bell, Wadi Sarga 22–26, as in SB, 5304, 5, two sorts of *knidia* are mentioned: the small and the big *knidia*. P. Oxy. 1752, 3 mentions a *knidion diploun*. We may agree with Lionel Casson that *knidia* of 4, 5, 8 and possibly similar capacities existed. He was, however, mistaken when he denied the existence of much bigger knidia, asserted in A. Segrè, *Metrologia*, p. 50 f. There, on the basis of research on the prices of wine and oil, I supposed the existence of *knidia* about 10 times larger than small *knidia*. This assumption has been confirmed by P. bibl. un. Giss. 22, where a big *knidion* is more than 8 times as large as a small *knidion*. This text was unknown to me, for I had written *Metrologia* four years before the publication of P. bibl. un. Giss. 22, but could have been considered by Casson, whose article was written in 1939. Probably the *knidion* of P. Goodspeed 30 (see *Metrologia*, p. 507 and *Symbolae Osloenses*, XIII [1932], p. 71 ff.) is a measure of ca. 90 alexandrian sextarii.

[2] For the *sextarius alexandrinus* see A. Segrè, *Metrologia* (1928), p. 72.

(b) The *knidia* were very probably filled with *antoniniani* introduced into Egypt at the time of Claudius II. The text very probably belongs to the period of this emperor.[3]

According to P. bibl. un. Giss. 22, four *knidia* full of silver drachmas were sent. The first *knidion* contained 40 talents of silver drachmas, the second 4 tal. 4500 dr., the third, 4 tal. 2400 drachmas, the fourth 4 tal. 2500 dr. All together 53 tal. 4500 dr.

The small *knidia* contained each ca. 5 talents of silver drachmas in the form of antoniniani [4] of the time of Claudius II. Supposing the *antoniniani* to be of an average weight of gr. 4 and of a specific weight of 8.5, and reckoning the interstices of the coins in the jars, each *antoninianus* fills a space of ca. cmc. 0.5. If we reckon the *antoninianus* = 2 *denarii* = 8 drachmas, 5 talents = 3666⅔ antoniniani fill a space of litr. 1.833; i.e. 4 alexandrian *sextarii* (litr. 1. 970). In the time of Diocletian the same *antoninianus*, probably at the end of the reign of this emperor, was raised to 12½ *denarii;* therefore the same sum of money in the jar would have occupied a space of ca. ⅔ of an alexandrian *sextarius*, while, if we reckon the jars filled with the *folles* of ca. 10 gr. equivalent to 25 *denarii*, each small jar would be of ca. ⅘ of an alexandrian *sextarius*.

If we reckon the jars filled with tetradrachmas of ca. 10 gr. each equal to a *denarius*, the small jars would be equivalent to 20 alexandrian sextarii.

The result of this short research leads us to a choice between the data of the following table:

Coins	Date	Capacity of the small knidion	Value in aurei of the 50 talents transported
Antoninianus	Claudius II	4 al. sext.	ca. 3000 aurei
tetradrachmon	" "	20 al. sext.	ca. 3000 aurei
antoninianus	Diocletianus	⅔ al. sext.	ca. 90 aurei
follis	"	⅘ al. sext.	ca. 90 aurei

Of all these data only the first is satisfactory.[5]

[3] The editor, H. Buttner, p. 17, n. 2, attributed the text to the middle of the third century, Wilcken, *Archiv. f. P. X* (1932), p. 273 ff. to the time of Diocletian. I think that the text belongs to the reign of Claudius II.

[4] For the *antoniniani* of the age of Claudius II, see A. Segrè, *Metrologia*, p. 567 ff., for the *antoniniani nummi italici* and the *folles nummi* of the age of Diocletian, see Byzantion, XV (1940–41), p. 252 ff.

[5] We could possibly also consider the case that the tetradrachma, raised in drachmas of the new small sort, were the coins filling the jars. If we admit this solution, the sending of the money has still to be placed not later than the earliest years of the reign of Diocletian. For the raising of the tetradrachma, see A. Segrè, *Byzantion*, XV, p. 256 ff. and *The Jurist*, I (1943), p. 30.